

RAILLERY DEFEATED  
BY  
CALM REASON:  
OR, THE  
NEW CARTESIAN METHOD  
OF  
ARGUING and ANSWERING  
EXPOS'D.

In a Letter to all Lovers of *Science,*  
*Candour* and *Civility.*

---

By *J. S.*

---

LONDON,

Printed for *D. Brown*, at the *Black Swan* and *Bible*, without *Temple-Bar*; and *A. Roper*, at the *Black-Roy*, over against *St. Dunstan's Church*, in *Fleet-street*, MDCXCIX.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N.Y.

1891

OF THE

LIBRARY OF THE

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N.Y.

1891

OF THE

LIBRARY OF THE

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N.Y.

1891

OF THE

LIBRARY OF THE

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N.Y.

1891



T O

# His Adversaries.

Gentlemen,

**A**ddresses of this nature did use, hitherto, to be made to Great Persons, for their Protection; or else, to Special Friends, to shew the Author's Respects: But, your Way of Managing this Controversie, has been so Preposterous, that it has oblig'd me to traverse those Usual Methods, and to present this Defensive of mine to your selves, tho' my Adversaries. And, because I fear that, coming from my Hand, it will not please you, I will endeavour to make it as little Unwelcome as I can. Let me ask you then, What means all this Railing, and Libelling? Can any Man of Common Sense think, this is the Method to promote Truth? And, if not; pray, What was your Aim in taking this Way, so Ungrateful to Sober Men, so

A 2      Nauseous

## DEDICATORY,

Nauseous to the Learned, and so Unchristian in it self? Does it conduce to prove TRUTH, or confute ERROUR? Or, rather, Does it not expose you to the Censure of all Lovers of Learning, and Civility; as Men, whose Reasons are at a Nonplus. I beseech you to consider, that Reason is our True Nature; and, therefore, whatever subsists by Reason, does naturally claim the Assent and Acceptation of Mankind: Whereas, PASSION, if excessive, is never Wise; and, especially, in Philosophy, where Evident Arguments ought to be the only Managers, 'tis a meer Folly. 'Tis Scandalous to Truth, as well as to Modesty, that Brawling should usurp the Place of Demonstrating. Indeed, no Credit being got by Answering Squabbles, you could not have invented any better Way to make me lose mine: And, the best Campurgetor I can bring, to keep me fair in the Opinion of the World, for Answering Books that abound in Raillery, but are quite void of Sense, is, that I saw it was a great Good to the Commonwealth of Learning, to lay open, once for all, such Ridiculous and Unfair Methods; that  
*their*

## To his Adversaries.

their Insignificancy being Expos'd, they may, for ever hereafter, be held Unworthy of any other Answer, but that of Scorn, and Neglect. What I most fear, is, that my Reader will think, that, while I am Replying to Mr. Le Grand's CENSURA, I am rather framing an Idea of the Incredible Weakness of Perverted Reason, than giving him a True Account of his Real and Perpetual Failings: But, my Comfort is, his Book is extant, to justify me. Philosophers use to say, that Nature abhors a Vacuum: I am sure, Rational Nature as much abhors an Emptiness of Sense; yet, this is all he has allow'd me to work upon, or confute.

Now, since to talk Incoherently, is, by all Mankind, held to be Folly; and, to do this in a High Degree, and Constantly, is that which Men call Distractedness, or Madness; which is a Total Disabling of our Rational Faculty: 'Tis manifest, hence, that REASON, which is our Nature, consists in the Conjoyning our Thoughts rightly; and, that 'tis the Perfection of our Reason, to discourse Coherently, or Connectedly. Wherefore

## DEDICATORY,

fore, my only Request to you, is, that, leaving off all those Foppish and Irrational Ways of Raillery, and Buffoonery, you would do your selves the Favour to pursue this Way of CONNEXION; so Natural to your Souls, so Honourable to your Credits, and so Beneficial to the Learned Part of Mankind. This Method, besides the doing a just Duty to Truth, will, over and above, make all Uncivil Language Impracticable: No such Stuff can find Place, while we are Laying Principles, and Deducing Legitimate Consequences; which are all a Philosopher has to do: Nor, can Impertinent Babblers find Opportunity to put in a Word, while such Serious Business is in Agitation. You have too much Disoblig'd and Scandaliz'd all Good Men, and no less Mortify'd me, in forcing me from this Solid Method; by your bringing the Controversie from Evidence of Arguing, to the worst sort of Drollery; since you neither brought against me any one Argument, the Terms of which you would undertake to be Connected; nor went about to solve the Close Connexion of mine; but, only buddl'd together a Med-  
ly

## To his Adversaries.

ly of Rambling Cavils, tending only to blemish my Reputation: Which forced me (it being expected I should say something, and you giving me no wiser Employment) to lose Time in laying open your Injurioufness, Weaknesses, and Falshoods; whereas, I do assure you, I should, with much more Joy and Satisfaction, have commended your Learning, and Civility, if your Carriage would have permitted me to do it with Truth.

I beg of you, that you would not (as Lawless Assassins and Robbers use) thus disgrace your selves, by assaulting me with your Vizards on; but, appear Bare-fac'd. Why should an Honest Man, in an Honest Cause, be asham'd to shew his Face? Own your true Nature, Reason: State your Cartesian Thesis; for, our Controversie begun about that; and, if you sinok from it, and run to other Subjects, you quit the Field. Then, lay Determinate Principles, and bring Determinate Arguments to prove your Assertions; and, I will promise you to do the same. But, I beseech you, let not the least Disrespectful Word pass between us, under Penalty of being held to have lost our Cause.

## DEDICATORY, &c.

*Cause. If you please to take this Way, so Proper for Settling Truth, I shall Honour and Respect you, and civilly Excuse whatever may hap to be Defective. But, if you resolve still to continue these Untoward Methods, here laid open, I shall not think it worth my while to stand Bartering Angry Repartees with you; but, will let you Rail on to your selves. Resting confident, that all Learned and Sober Men will both Condemn your Prevaricating Incivility; and, will also hold me Excus'd, if I let you gratifie your own Genius, and apply my self to better Employments, more becoming a Scholar, and a Christian.*

Your Sincere, tho<sup>t</sup>

Undeservedly Injur'd,

Friend, and Servant,

J. S.



(r)

---

---

RAILLERY DEFEATED  
BY  
CALM REASON:  
OR, THE  
NEW CARTESIAN METHOD  
OF  
*Arguing and Answering*  
E X P O S ' D :

In a Letter to all Lovers of *Science*,  
*Candour and Civility*.

---

Gentlemen,

I. **W**Hen Pretenders to Philosophy, instead of producing *Arguments* of their own, or *Answering* those that are brought by others, do break in upon all the Rules of Decency and Civility, and betake themselves to *Railing and Libelling*,

B

'tis



'tis the Concern, not only of the *Learned*, but of all *Mankind* to declare their Abhorrence of such an Indirect and Senseless Prevarication. Invectives cast such a Shadow upon the clearest Truths, and introduce so pernicious a Precedent into Disputation about Points of Philosophy, and those also of a more Sacred Nature, that, unless this absurd Carriage be discountenanc'd, the best Efforts of *Exact Reason* will be turn'd into *Buffoonery*. That nothing but my Opposing *Cartesianism*, either by Undeniable *Matter of Fact*, or by my *Arguments*, did force Mr. Le Grand and his Complice to this *Hurry of Passion*, and (as your selves will character it when you see their manner of Writing) *Madness of Malice*, will appear manifestly by a plain Stating of the Case; which is this.

2. Very many of my *Learned Friends* (tho' it was my Concern to name but One of them) had blam'd my *Ignobile Otium*, and had press'd me to write. To speak candidly, I cannot perfectly remember, that they desir'd me, in express Terms, to write *Philosophy*; but I am certain I understood them so, the Circumstances seeming very Improper to publish any thing else. Being thus won, I cast about how I might make my Productions as *Universally Beneficial* as I was able. At first sight I Discover'd, and had, (with many others, who

who aim'd at True Science,) in my Thoughts, *Bewail'd*, that a kind of *Scepticism*, or *Despair of Certain Knowledge*, had insensibly crept into the World; and I had experienc'd how it had corrupted many excellent Wits, and made them turn *Libertines*. I saw that this dangerous Dis-temper of the Mind was grown very *Epidemical*; of which, in my Preface to *Solid Philosophy Asserted*, I so heartily and feelingly complain. I saw that this *Sceptical Humour* did hinder the Progress of *Scientifical Knowledge*, and the Improvement of *Rational Nature*; nay, that it brought a vast Prejudice to Religion it self: For, those who had only *Wit* enough to raise *Objections* against *Christian Faith*, but wanted *Solidity of Judgment*, and *True Principles*, enabling them to settle their *Volatil Thoughts*, were apt to think that the *Mysteries* it propos'd were altogether *Repugnant to Reason*, and *Inexplicable*. But, particularly, I had observ'd the Increase of *Atheism*, and (which is next to it) of *Deism* here in *England*. Which kind of Men, making a *Scoff* at *Scripture*, and disregarding *Church*, *Councils*, *Fathers*, and all *Authority*, could no way be so properly and effectually combated, or confuted, as by *REASON*; to which, and which only, they appeal'd. Here-upon, I resolv'd to bend my best Endeavours

yours to advance the Way of Exact Reasoning; and, thence, pitch'd upon the Writing and Publishing a METHOD to Science.

3. That the Regard I had to *Christian Faith* was the Chief Motive that prevail'd with me to write *Philosophy*, or that Treatise, will appear hence: First, Because it is manifest that I took there all Occasions that could come in my way, to apply my Discourses to the *Defence of Faith*; and when I had establish'd any Truth by way of Reason, I did, upon the Spot, make use of it to confute some *Heretic*; or else some Tenet which seem'd not so well consistent with Faith, but subcontrary to it. For Example; In my *METHOD*, p. 6. I argue against the *Scepticks*. Pag. 7. against the Pre-existence of *Souls*. Pag. 32. I prove that Man is but One Thing, and not Two, as the *Cartesians* hold; of which more hereafter. Pag. 43. I conclude against the *Epicurean Hypothesis*. I demonstrate, p. 59, 60. that the World had a *Beginning of Motion*; and, consequently, that there is some *Spiritual Nature*, which, either by its own Virtue, or by Power deriv'd from some Supreme and First Cause of Motion, did move *Unactive Matter*. I hint, p. 80. the Grounds which shew the Mystery of the Blessed Trinity conformable to Right Reason. I prove, p. 93. that

that Angels are not properly in Place. I explicate, p. 97, 98. in what GOD's Attribute of *Eternity*, and the *Æviternity* of Angels, do consist. I take care, p. 105, 106. that Weak Men do not mis-interpret Scripture, by taking *Metaphorical Expressions Literally*, and *Dogmatically*, as Mr. Le Grand does frequently, and very rashly; from which proceeded the Heresie of the *Anthropomorphites*, and divers others. I explicate, p. 109, 110. how, and in what Sense, *Religious Honour*, or *Respect* may be given to *Creatures*, without shocking any well-meaning Christian; or breeding Disunion amongst them. I shew, p. 112. the Incomparableness of GOD's Divine Word, the *Holy Scriptures*, from its having or bearing many several sorts of Senses, and yet all of them True. I attempt, p. 137, 138, &c. by a Logical Medium, to demonstrate the *Existence of a Deity*. I shew, p. 153. the Way to perfect Souls in *Solid Vertue*. I demonstrate, p. 277, 278, &c. GOD's *Providence* in the whole Course of Nature, even to the very least Effect: That he cannot be the *Author of Sin*: How senseless a *Sin Irresignation* is: How great our *Gratitude* to GOD ought to be: And, how *Wise* the Doctrine of *Christianity* is. I manifest, p. 286. how *Ignorant Atheists* are. Pag. 299. That the World had a *Beginning*;

and, that there are *Spiritual Natures*. I demonstrate at large, p. 302. that there is a *Self-existent Being*, or a *Deity*. I prove, p. 318. against the *Origenists*, how Rational it is that there should be an *Eternal Hell* for the Devils, and wicked Souls. I I settle very largely, to the End of that *Lesson*, the Rational Grounds, *previous to Humane and Divine Faith*. And, p. 343. I shew, from a *Logical Medium*, the Unreasonableness of *Opinionative Faith*, which grounds *Light Credulity*, and *Bigottery*. I inform my Reader, p. 360, 361, &c. how to arm himself against being surpriz'd by *Fallacies* brought against *Christianity*. And, Lastly, p. 373. I demonstrate, that the *Practical Judgement* of a *Sinner*, and, consequently, all *Sin*, is clearly *Opposite to Right Reason*; and an *Evident Fallacy*, according to the *Commonest Rules of True Logick*.

4. I pursue the same good End in my *Solid Philosophy Asserted*; and take all Occasions (even though not given me sometimes) to apply my former Grounds to higher Subjects. I will only touch upon some Instances. I explicate, p. 174, and 199. *GOD's Immensity*, and set it above those low Conceits fram'd by our Fancy. As likewise, (p. 202.) his *Self-Existence*, and (p. 211.) his *Absolute Infinity*. I shew (p. 223.) the *Necessity of a Supernatural*

natural Doctrine, against the *Deists*. Pag. 225. How to conquer in our *Spiritual Warfare*. Pag. 227. That Man, pre-determin'd by GOD, *determines himself*, or is *Free*. Pag. 229. Whence *Sin* springs. I lay open (p. 271, 272, &c.) the Nature of Solid Vertue. I shew (p. 302, and 391.) the Clear *Distinction* between *Corporeal* and *Spiritual* Natures; which is of vast Concern, both to Philosophy, Divinity, and Faith it self; and, is the best Rule of Interpreting Scripture in such Passages as concern *Spirits*, unless the known Faith of the Catholick Church has already establish'd the Doctrinal Point to our hand. I distinguish (p. 438, 439,) what is due to *Reason*, what to *Divine Revelation*. And, (p. 441, 442.) that *Reason* is not to be rely'd upon in Things *above Reason*. Lastly, (p. 452.) I give a Certain Rule how we can never come to be *mis-led* by *Authority*, &c.

5. Secondly, That I writ *Philosophy* to maintain the Interest of *Christian Faith*, and not out of the vain Motive of being held a *meer Philosopher*, does farther appear hence, That in the Epistle Dedicatory to *Solid Philosophy Asserted*, I did civilly challenge the *Socinians*, *Deists* and *Atheists*, that some Learned Men of those Sects would please to send me those Reasons which they, or their Leaders, do judge to be of most

*Weight* why they cannot embrace the Doctrine of the Trinity, or Christianity; which they may send privately, and unnam'd, to the Stationer who publishes this Book: Promising them, that I would give their Arguments their full Weight, and publish an Answer to them. Which manifestly shews, that my Design was, to apply my Books of Philosophy to the Explication and Defence of Reveal'd Faith. From some of those Sects I might have expected a Rude Opposition; tho' I do not think any of them would have thought it Prudent, or Creditable to themselves, or their Cause, to leave my Arguments and my Books Unanswer'd, and let fly at me with Personal Reflexions; but, that those who bear the Name of Christians, should, instead of Answering my Reasons, fall to Decry, Traduce and Libel those very Books, and their Author, in the most Vile and Scurrilous manner, I could not have expected. This plainly convinces all sober Men, that these angry Gentlemen esteem nothing so Sacred as the Satisfaction of their private Pique. But, nothing is so Fiery, and Furious, as Men too fond of Empty Fame, when they fore-see their Ignorance is in danger to be baffl'd. I dare presume, that whoever considers the several Particulars lately mention'd, to demonstrate which, in those Treatises, I have laid Grounds; (not to speak of many



ny others I have omitted,) will acknowledge they are of no small Weight; and therefore, that the Writer who advances Positions which are so useful and serviceable to Christianity, ought (were it but out of respect to that Best Cause) to be *civilly treated*, even tho' he had *erred*. Nor could my Adversaries have shewn a greater Kindness to those Sects above-mentioned, than to bend their whole Endeavours to revile and blacken an Author, who, as they already saw, had enter'd the Lists against those Men; so to fore-stall (as far as they were able) the Efficacy of all his future Labours to defend Christian Faith. Poor Men! What Service has either of them done for *Christianity*? They have spent their whole Life, or the greatest part of it, in contemplating Groundless Fancies, coin'd by their own Brain; or, (as they call it,) in *Eliciting*, or *Producing Ideas*; and in talking Voluntaries while they explicate them, without either Principles or Connexion; and that's the utmost of their empty Performances. And then, when they should defend their Cause by *Arguments*, if we will not allow their *Explications* for good *Proof*, they fall to Railing and Labelling. But Envy is of so froward an Humour, that it will neither do Good it self, nor let it be done by others.

6. I might add, as a Third Argument, to prove, that my chief Aim in my Writings, was, to do my Duty to Faith, that I have oppos'd all the *Whole Way of Ideas*, because I saw them very Unfit to *Explicate* or *Defend* it. Far be it from me to cast in a Suspicion, that the Authors who follow that Way are *Unsound* in Faith. What I affirm, is, That I can neither conceive how the *Ideas* of the *Cartesians* can well suite with some Points of Faith, (of which more hereafter;) nor that those of Mr. *Locke*, tho' his Simple Ideas being taken from the Things in Nature, his Doctrine is incomparably better grounded than that of *Cartesius*, do so clearly serve to explicate Faith, but that they are obnoxious to some Exceptions. I should be better satisfy'd with both those *Hypotheses*, could I once see a Body of Speculative Divinity; or even an *Explication* of two or three Points of *Reveal'd Faith*, manifesting the Agreement of Faith with the Principles of Right Reason; so that we may see how the Superstructure of that Divine Doctrine does accord with those Grounds; as it must with True Science. For, I cannot but judge, that since [*Verum vero non contradicit,*] Philosophical Truths, which are *Inferior* ones, and lie level to our Reason, and therefore are *Clearer* to our Understanding than are those *Sublime* Mysteries, and are  
more

more maniable by it, ought to lend their Assistance to our weak Capacities in *Explaining* and *Defending* them from being Contradictory to True Reason: Whence, I cannot think *The Philosophy* to be *True*, which, like an *Officious Hand-maid*, is not thus Subservient to her Mistress, *Faith*. And, if any Writer, or Sustainer of those Sects above-mention'd, shall think fit to attack any Article of *Reveal'd Faith*, as contrary to *True Science*, I doubt not but to make it evidently appear by the *Doctrine* I have settl'd in my *METHOD*, how far short their Arguments are from any Shew of Concluding.

7. Lastly, It was not in me any Fondness of advancing *Paradoxes*, but my Zeal of pursuing the same *Good End*, which made me attempt to demonstrate in my *Method* divers Points which shock the Fancy of the Vulgar, and, perhaps, of some Learned Readers, till they well weigh their Grounds; viz. those of the *Immutability* of a *Pure Spirit*, and the *Impossibility* of *Annihilation* by *GOD's Ordinary Power*. I had observ'd, that the perfect Distinction between *Body* and *Spirit* was *All-understood* by most, and their *Natures Confounded* by divers *Ingenious Writers*. Also, that very few did penetrate thorowly the Nature of their *State*, their kind of *Duration*, or their manner of *Operating*.

rating; but conceited them to have a kind of *Commensuration* to Body, Time and Corporeal Operation. Which put, it was impossible to develt them totally of Corporeal Predicates; or, to evince clearly against *Atheists*, that there were any Beings of a Nature truly and properly *Spiritual*, or *Indivisible*, unless we could prove they were *Contradictorily Different* from Body, and all that belong'd to it, excepting only as to their *Genus*, or Common Notion, *Ens*, or *Thing*. Wherefore, reflecting of what Importance it was to clear this main Point, both for *Philosophy*, the Adequate Object of which these two Natures are; neither of which could be clearly understood, unless they be thus perfectly, that is, *contradictorily Distinguish'd*: As also, for *Theology*, which treats mostly of *Spiritual Things*, and *Spiritual Natures*: And, Lastly, for *Faith*; because, otherwise, *Atheists*, who deny all *Spirituality*, might take a Conceit, that we meant nothing by a [*Spirit*,] but only some more refin'd sort of *Matter*; and, thence, might come to deny also the *Immortality of the Soul*, (which is one of the main Grounds of all Religion,) if we ascrib'd to *Spirits* any Mode, or Manner of Operating, which appertains to *Body*; nay, would thence be apt to conclude, that there is nothing above meer *Matter*: Hence, I saw it fit to demonstrate the former.

mer of these *Theses*, viz. their *Immutability*, as the Best, and most Convincing Proof of their *Immortality*; and, at the same time, quite defeat *Origenism*, and the Denial of an *Eternal Hell*, which (tho' it be a known Point of Christian Faith) is now creeping again into Fashion in *England*. And, it was for the same good Reason, that I went about to demonstrate that Point of the *Impossibility of Annihilation*; because our Modern *Socinians* explicate the Spiritual Perdition of the Soul, by *Annihilation*. And, that the Reason why I advanc'd and demonstrated those *Theses*, was out of my Respect to Faith, appears yet more manifestly, because I apply them still to the Confutation of those Sects.

8. Hitherto, then, it is not visible to the Eye of any sober Christian, how I, or those Books of mine, could fall into the high Displeasure of Mr. *Le Grand* to that degree, as to revile my self, and degrade them to the lowest degree of Contempt. If he had dislik'd my Reasons which establish'd these Particulars in my *Method*, he might, in behalf of Truth, have confuted them; and he should not, in the least, have disoblig'd me; nor had it broke any Friendship between us. But, now comes my Crime: It was my necessary Duty, while I was writing my *Method to Science*, to confute those Methods advan-  
ced

ced by others, which I judg'd to be *False* ones: Whence, I took notice of that of *Malbranche*, who pretends that all Science comes by Divine Revelation; and of that of *Cartesius*, who, (as the Writer of his Life tells us,) by endeavouring to bring himself to question all the Certainty he had receiv'd from his Senses, fell into Fits of *Enthusiasm*. I thought it a Duty I ow'd to Mankind, and to the Subject I was writing of, to forewarn Studious Men of following such Methods as might prejudice their Wits; and, withall, lead them into Error; and to declare, that I could not think that God ever intended That for the only Means (as they pretend) for Men to get Knowledge, which might make them lose their Wits in looking after it. This highly offended those *Cartesians*, and transported them into most Tragical Exclamations. But with what Reason? It lay directly in the Road I had taken; and, What Obligation had I to either of those Authors, that I should dissemblingly favour them, against the Duty I ow'd to my Readers, and the Regard I had for Truth? It could not proceed from any private Pique against their Persons, for they had never injur'd me. Again; Had I wrong'd either of them, it had been easie to confute me, by shewing that I either falsify'd the Words I cited, or suppress'd their own Interpretation.

tation of them. But, both these being impossible, and Contutation by way of *Reason* not being their Talent, another Way (tho' nothing to the purpose) was thought fit; which was, to rail at me aloud, and bespatter my Person.

9. I had brought also some Arguments against divers Positions of the *Cartesian* Doctrine, advanc'd by Mr. *Le Grand*; but I had not one unhandfom Word against his Person, but spoke *respectfully* of him: Which, from a *Scholar*, and a *Well-bred* Man, might have merited the like Return. If the Arguments against *Cartesianism* gave him too much Trouble to answer, it was too good a Fault to be sorry for it. It seems, there was no other Crime in them, nor me; for, could they have been Answer'd by *Calm Reason*, there had been no need to have Recourse to *Passion* and *Invektive*, which abounded in his Reply. A hundred Cavils, which were *foreign* to the Matter in hand, were hal'd in by head and shoulders; and fitted up by sinister Constructions, and false Representations, to lay an *Odium* upon me. Not one of those Questions were stated, or fully treated of, to benefit the Reader, by letting him see what was *True*, what *not*: But a few Words were snatch'd out of my Books, here and there; and then distorted, and perverted, to make them fit to be descanted upon with Raillery.



Raillery. My *Conclusions*, against all Laws of Disputation, were stoutly *Deny'd*: The *Proofs*, by which they subsisted, were stifled in *Silence*; at least, the *Force* of my Arguments were scarce ever taken notice of: Whereas, the most puny Logician knows that a *Conclusion*, for which a *Proof* is brought, is to stand firm, and be allow'd, till the *Proof* for it be *Invalidated*. Do they think I would have taken it ill from any Man, if he shew'd me the Weakness of my Argument? I do assure them, I am so far from that Humour, that I should take it for a *great Favour*: For, by this means, they would either *satisfie* me, by convincing me of my Error; or else, by Attempting to answer my Reasons, and not performing it, *Truth* would become more *Victorious*; which is all an honest Man ought to aim at. On the contrary, How civilly did I invite Mr. Le Grand, to take the Manly Way of Arguing becoming a Scholar, and to *prove* what he *says*? Ending with these Words, *Id. Cartes. p. 12, 13. Nec peto à Te, &c.* Nor do I require, of you to Perform this; at least, Endeavour it, and you shall see with what Honour I will treat you, tho' you do sometimes, nay, often, fail. But I was not so Fortunate, as to meet with such a Candid Adversary. The Way of *Invective* was resolv'd on, as more favourable to their Cause; and all Over-

tures.

tures that were handsome, and becoming Learned Men, were rejected.

10. Now, Gentlemen, since I have, in my Reply, shewn this Carriage of theirs Evident by Matter of *Fact*, judge how strangely *Imprudent* (not to say, worse) these Men are, who can persuade themselves, that this manner of Writing, never taken by any sober Man since the World stood when he is to answer another Man's *Arguments*, or to establish his own *Thesis*, does not perfectly convince every Intelligent Person, that they are at an end of their *Reason* when they fall into such a high Salivation of *Passion*; and this without any other Provocation, than what my *Arguments* gave them? Can their pelting their Adversary with such abominable *Slanders*, (even supposing him guilty of them all,) either Answer his *Proofs* for his Doctrine, or avail in the least to *prove* their own? Were the Person they impugn a Profess'd Atheist, it could not justify a Writer who is to defend *Truth*, to run away from the Question, and fall to *Impertinent Brabbling*, and bring in twenty *Foreign Exceptions*, and *Personal Defamations*, which are nothing at all to the Point. Nay, it would, in that Case, be far more requisite to take care to confute him with Pregnant and *Solid Reasons*; lest prudent Readers, who are sagacious enough to see that Ill Language, Bawling

Bawling Exclamations, and Personal Reflexions, are certain Symptoms of *Non-pluss'd Reason*, should be inveigl'd by those Passionate Prevarications, and by such a wild Management, to think that he has *Truth* on his side, and so come to embrace his *Errours*. But, will it not look like a Jest, that he who was formerly, by all that know him, held a good Christian, and had writ many Books for Christianity, should immediately, upon his opposing the *Cartesians*, be guilty of so many Impieties, Blasphemies and Heresies, and become as Black as the Devil; and his Books, which found such an Universal Acceptation among Learned Men, (except two or three Maligners,) should, all on a sudden, become *stark naught*? Is it not prodigious, that Men who are at Age to have Common Sense in them, should so foolishly and childishly *hood-wink themselves*, and then think *none sees them*? The World, whatever they think, is wiser, than to judge that any Credit is to be given to them who, by their Carriage, confess themselves to be *piqu'd*, and exasperated, even to an Extasie of Fury. Their Transport of Passion too visibly discovers, that their Souls are not *acted* by the Spirit of Sober Reason, Charity, and Candid Love of Truth; but agitated by a violent Whirlwind of Fury, Envy, and Resolute Uncharitableness.

tableness. Their Demeanour being such, that, even tho' they had *Truth* on their side, they would disgrace their Cause by their Hot-headed Managery of it.

II. These unoccasion'd Contumelies being the most Disgraceful that could be laid upon one of my Quality, and Rank, did a little transport me in my *Idea Cartesianæ*, where I was to reply to them; and, made me use, now and then, some smart Expressions, more than were precisely necessary for my Defence; for which I ask Mr. Le Grand's, and my Reader's Pardon; tho' they were no more than such as every Prudent Man may discern that himself, as a Writer, had given himself. But I carefully avoided all Imputations of *Irreligion*, either in his *Intentions*, or his *Writings*. And, if I saw that, in any Circumstance, my Words might occasion such a Misconstruction, I charitably and carefully defended his Credit in such Points, and declar'd him innocent. All the Reflexions I us'd, were on his Manner of Writing; which it was impossible to avoid, if I would do a Just Right to my self. But he liberally requited me, in his *Censura*; and gave me Pounds for my Pence: For, he tells me, in the Close of his Epistle to the Reader, that *Non quicquam per integrum Responsum suum sine mendacio dixit*; that I have not spoken any thing (that is, not one Word) throughout

throughout my whole Answer, without a Lye. So that my Answer, which consists of two hundred seventy two Pages, is nothing but *one continu'd Lye*. Upon my word, this was *shew'd*, and *home*; and, if this Libel of his, which usher'd in, and made way for the following one, be but capable of Immortality, my Name will be Eterniz'd for a Lyar, to the World's End. Certainly, these Men are the oddest sort of Writers, that ever were guilty of Ink-shed. Other Men, when they write, do entertain some Hope they shall be *believ'd*; but these Men never think on, nor regard that Obvious Consideration. They press on furiously, to attain their *Beloved End*; which is, to *disgrace* that abominable *J. S.* And this so totally possesses and fills their *whole Fancy*, that not the least Prudential Consideration can peep up there, to make them wisely pursue their *own Design*. What Man in his Wits, do they think, will believe that a Man of known Credit, who never in his Life was not'd, or thought, to be a Lyar, should, *in the Twinkling of a Bed-staff*, (as their Noble *Jack Pudding*, in his *Dialogue*, p. 13. styles it,) tell a Lye in every Line, for Two Hundred Seventy two Pages together. Logicians say, that an Argument that proves too much is naught, and proves Nothing at all. Such will be the Fate of their Ranting Fits of Passion; they so over-  
strain

strain all Belief, that no Credit will be given to any one thing they say; nor did I ever know that Maxim of *Machiavell*, [*Calumniare fortiter*, &c.] more untowardly and awkwardly apply'd. Yet, I must say this in their Commendation, that they are Men of a most Magnanimous Courage and Confidence. Should I talk at this swaggering Rate, I should fear it would spoil my whole ensuing Book; and so utterly lose my Credit, that not a Word I said would be believ'd.

12. Being heartily weary of this brawling Way of theirs, so contrary to my Genius, which, all who read my Books may see, does aim at *Close and Solid Reasoning*; I publish'd a small Treatise, settling the *First Truth*, or *First Principle*, fundamentally on the *Ideas* in God's Creative Intellect; for which Reason, I intitl'd it *Non Ultra*, it being impossible to go higher. Where also I demonstrated the Shallowness of the *First Principle* of the *Cartesians*. In it I begg'd of them but meerly to name, or put down Categorically, any one Principle of the *Cartesian Doctrine*, which they judge to be the strongest, or most Evident; and I would undertake to Demonstrate, that, either it is no Principle, or else, that it has no Influence at all upon their Hypothesis. I declar'd, that I did this, to put an End to this Controversie, and to settle Peace.

Peace. I propos'd there, p. 121. that we should confine our selves to Half a Sheet of Paper; and, that all should be transacted by pure Dint of Reason; and, that he who shall use the least Uncivil Word to his Adversary, and falls into Passion, shall be held to have lost his Cause, and to be reduc'd to a Non-plus. Could any Proposal, or any Overture, be more Civil, Equal, or Welcome to Men who love Truth and Ingenuity; or be more Efficacious to Decide the Question, and stop the Way to all Possibility of Wrangling. But that's the Fault of it; They have a great Talent in Brabbling, but they are not at all gifted for Arguing conclusively, Demonstrating, or Laying Principles. More than this, I offer'd, that, If they can shew their Cause has any Principles to support it, (without which, by the way, none ought to hold it True,) that I would make them Satisfaction, by acknowledging publicly, that I had foolishly over-ween'd; and take the Shame to my self, for my Rash Presumption. By which candid and frank Offer, I put my self upon the greatest Disadvantage imaginable; and gave them a greater Advantage against me, than they could ever hope to gain any other Way. Lastly, I did all this needlessly, without either being Forc'd, or Desir'd, to do it; but meerly out of my own Voluntary Motion, and out of my sincere Desire that Truth should be made appear.



13. But, what Return, do you think, was made me, for this Fair and Candid Proposal? While I was expecting this *Half-sheet* of Paper, that was to consist of nothing but *Calm Reason*, and was likely to decide the whole Controversie; out comes a *Dialogue*, in English, under the Name of Mr. *Merry-man*, A-la-mode of our *Bartholomew Fair* Jack-Pudding; stuffed with Ignorance, Impudence, Falsification, Foul-mouth'd Railing, Scornful Jeers, and other Scurrilous Language: Which, for any thing I see yet, are all the *Cartesian* Principles I am to expect. The Reader will see how shrewdly he confutes me; For, he tells me over and over, I am an *Ass*, a *Rare Fellow*, and as *Proud as Lucifer*: That my Writings *smell rank of the Fumes of an Intoxicated Brain*: That I am a kind of *Devil Incarnate*; for, he says, he begins to suspect I have a *Cloven Foot*; and, that no body, but the *Devil*, set me on *Writing*: That I run down *Piety, Religion, and GOD himself*; and forty such *Good Morrows*. Certainly, by this Description, I must have ten *Legions* in me at least: Yet, the Jest is this; this silly Fop, who would pretend great Zeal for *Faith*, and *GOD's Honour*, dares not appear bare-fac'd, to write against such a Monster of Wickedness; but keeps a *Vizard* on, and masks his Name under that of *Merry-man*; which we must suppose

suppose he does, either because he is *ashamed*, and should *blush* if good Christians knew he took GOD's Part against *Lucifer* and his Imps, which is an odd piece of *Modesty*; or else, because under that *Disguize*, he may lye, forge, and say or do any thing, and yet none challenge him with it, or call him to Account. He falsifies the Places where he does not quote my Books; and when he does, he picks out a few Words, and concealing the Tenour of the Discourse, *travesties* them to any Sense he pleases. He is so impudent, that, against Matter of Fact, known openly to great Multitudes, particularly, to the Right Reverend the Bishop of *Madagascar*, he objects very confidently, that some of my Pieces of Divinity were *damn'd* (that Word pleases him, and his Friend mightily) by the *Sorbon Doctors*; of which, more anon. He has a sling at the Bishops, for Negligence in their Duty; or at me, for printing my Books without their Approbation: I beseech him to shew us, in his Huge Wisdom, that 'tis an *Episcopal* Duty to approve all *Philosophical* Books; or for *Philosophy-Writers* to have *Episcopal* Approbations, ere they print them! Had *Le Grand*, had *Cartesius* any such? Or, did this Libeller ask any such Approbation for his Libel, which, by the Antient Canons of the Church, renders him liable to

Ex-

*Excommunication*; nay, (by *Conc. Arelat. 2. Canon. 24.*) he is forbidden to *Communicate till his Death*: And, lest he should think a Provincial Council's Decree does not debar him from the Sacrament, it is added there immediately; *Sicut Magna Synodus*, (that is, a General Council) *did formerly decree*. His Ignorance is so profound, that he understands not one of the Questions he touches upon, and defiles. As, when I affirm that *GOD is not the Immediate Cause of Motion*, he runs to *Creation*, which is not perform'd by way of *Motion*, but *Instantaneously*: Whence, since *Motion* being *Successive Quantity*, and so Proportionate Parts may be taken of it, (for example, *Half* of it,) and *Creation* gives *Being*, by this Learned Doctrine of his, a Thing may *half-be, half-not-be*; and so his Miraculous Stupidity has found out a *Medium* between the two Contradictions, *Est*, and *Non-est*.

14. Who the Author of this Libel is, tho' he thinks he walks in a Milt, is well enough known. He was formerly convicted of flandering a Pious and Virtuous Ecclesiastick: And now, it seems, having the Ambition to take the *Highest Degree* in that Infamous *Art of Calumny*, he took this Occasion to *Commence Doctor-Libeller*. But, too much of a Pamphlet so silly and ridiculous, that 'tis below Contempr.

15. And now, Gentlemen, is not this *mightry Learned*? Are not these most *Profound Principles*? Does not every Man, who has but half an Eye, see plainly that Mr. Le Grand, and his Party, distrusting the Way of Laying Principles, so unfriendly to their Cause, which has none, are forc'd to have Recourse to *Railing*; and endeavour all they can to bring our Philosophical Contest from the Way of *Connected Reason*, to *Farce and Drollery*? I discern, by his desire it should *be told me what he says*, he thinks I should set my self to answer his Libel: But he is mistaken. 'Tis too much Honour to him, that I take notice of it at all. Nor does it spring from any Desert of his, that I do even so much; but out of regard to some weak Persons, amongst whom, I am inform'd, they spread it in hugger-mugger; and, to meet with the private Cavils of the Triumvirate: For, I hear, they have hook'd in a Third Man, to strengthen their thin Party!

16. Notwithstanding, I must confess, I owe Satisfaction to every Reader of my Books, if in any place I speak obscurely; and to *themselves* too, if their resolute Malice would render them capable to receive it: For, I look upon *Them* too as my *Brethren*; tho', at present, being *pigu'd*, they are much *out of Humour*; taking it to be my

my Duty to use all the Effectual Ways I can, *Lucrari Fratres meos*. I must confess, it is not Fit that such High and Abstruse Points should be treated in *English*, in regard they transcend the Fancies of the Vulgar; who are Incompetent Readers, much less Judges, of such Speculations; but, since they have thus forc'd me to it, let the Imprudence lie at their Doors, if I treat somewhat largely, in our Vulgar Language, of the main Points which they strive to render so Odious.

17. 'Tis to be noted, then, That the Perfect Distinction between *Corporeal* and *Spiritual* Natures was formerly unknown to many, even of the Antient Fathers; the Doctrine of *Faith*, (only which was their Concern, as *Fathers*,) abstracting from such particular Questions, which belong to Philosophical Speculations: In-  
somuch that *Joannes Thessalonicensis*, in the Second *Nicene* Council, said, that the Angels were, indeed, *Intelligibles*, (he means, *Intellectuales*;) *Sed non omnino Corporis expertes, verum tenui corpore præditi, & aereo, sive igneo*: That Angels were not without a Body, but had a Thin Body of Air or Fire. Nay, this Opinion of his was approv'd of by the Council. And, which is yet more, he says, that *Catholica Ecclesia sic sentit*; that is, 'Tis the Sentiment of the *Catholick Church*: Which shews, that this

Opinion was very *Universal*. Though it ought here to be observ'd, that he says not that the Catholick Church holds this as a *Doctrine of Faith*, or descended from Christ and his *Apostles*; but only, that the Church *sic sentit*; that is, *thinks* or *opines* so. For, no wise Man can doubt that the Fathers, in Council, being not only *Witnesses* of the *Faith* deliver'd from the fore-going Church, which they *propagate*, and transmit to the Following Age, (which gives them, properly, and formally, the Denomination of *Fathers*; ) but, being also Philosophers, and Divines; they do hence, sometimes, deliver themselves, (tho' not in their Decrees of *Faith*) as Men endow'd with these later Qualifications.

18. The Reason which made so many Holy Men fall into that great Errour, contradicted now by most of the Divines of the Christian Church, was, because, the World not having yet arriv'd to that Maturity of Science as to get above Fancy, and therefore not distinguishing perfectly those two sorts of Substances, hence they were apt to take *Metaphorical* Texts of Scripture, (such as those generally are, where it speaks of *Spiritual Natures*, and their *Operations*,) to be meant *Dogmatically*, and *Literally*: Nor, consequently, could they conceive otherwise, but that Pure Spirits were *Passive*; and therefore,  
of

of their own Nature, *Mutable*, by Impressions on them, as *Bodies* are; and, consequently, *Matter* being the only *Potential* or *Passive Principle*, to have some *Materiality*, or *Corporeity*, in their Natures. Yet were not all the Antient Fathers thus weakly grounded: For, one of the Antientest, *Tertullian*, was more Solid, and (*Lib. de Anima, cap. 2.*) lays this for a kind of Principle: [*Incorporatitas nihil patitur, non habens per quod pati possit; aut si habet, hoc est Corpus: In quantum enim omne Corporale passibile est, in tantum omne quod passibile est, Corporale est: An Incorporeal (that is, a Spiritual) Thing cannot suffer (from another Agent,) having nothing in it, by means of which it can suffer; (that is, having no Matter in it, through which only those Things, call'd Bodies, are Passive:)* Or, if it have any such, it is a Body; since, for what Reason every Bodily Thing is Passive, for the same Reason every thing that is Passive, is Corporeal.] Which Principle, so perfectly consonant to the *Aristotelian Doctrine*, was, I believe, the Reason why, speaking of those in the Intermediate State, he says, *Non dimitteretur nisi modico quoque delicto mora Resurrectionis expenso*: He shall not be pardon'd, till every little Sin be paid for by the Delay of the Resurrection. Nor is it hard to alledge many other Antient Fathers, of the same Sentiment.



timent, whose Works were never censured for it, nor their Opinion condemn'd, but by such insignificant Triflers as *Mer y-man*, and his Fellow-Banterer.

19. In process of time the Christian Schools embracing the Categories of *Aristotle*, which contain all our Natural Notions; reduc'd into *Heads*; which they also *Divided* with more Exactness than formerly; Men's Thoughts grew to be more *Distinct*, and *Clear*, which, if well pursu'd, and held to, dispos'd their Reason for *Demonstration*. I dare affirm, the former Words of *Tertullian* do contain in them a *Metaphysical* Demonstration; and I can as little doubt, but that (their Principles obliging them to it) many others had held the same; but that Impressions from *Bodily* Substances, with which we perpetually converse, had so possess'd their Fancies, that, tho' they might see it follow'd from their Principles, yet they were startl'd at the Conclusion; and were afraid of the Consequences which they fore-saw would ensue from such a Position. As for my self, I shall content my self at present with producing one single Demonstration, (omitting many others;) which I the rather pitch upon, because I pretended it *Unanswerable*; and Mr. *Le Grand* has undertaken to Answer it. 'Tis this:

20. All Created Things are either *Divisible*, or *Indivisible*; which two Notions, as *Differences*, divide the *Genus*, or *Common Head* of *Ens*, or *Thing*, and constitute those two Sorts or *Species* of Things, call'd *Body* and *Spirit*. Therefore, these two Kinds or *Species* of Things can agree only in the *Genus*, or *Common Notion* of *Thing*, and differ in every *Consideration* else, and this *Contradictorily*; *Divisible* and *Indivisible*, which are their *Differences*, being clearly *Contradictory* to one another. Wherefore, whatever is truly and properly *Affirm'd* of the *One*, must be *Deny'd* of the *Other*: But, of that *Divisible Thing*, or *Substance*, call'd *Body*, it is truly *Affirm'd*, that it is *Successive* in its *Operations*; Therefore, of an *Indivisible Thing*, or a *Pure Spirit*, (such as an *Angel* is,) it must be *Deny'd* that it is *Successive* in its *Operations*; that is, it must be *Affirm'd* of it, that it is *Unsuccessive*, or *Instantaneous*, in its *Operations*; and, consequently, all it can operate, is in an *Instant*. Whence follows, demonstratively, that it is *Immutable*: For, since to be *Mutable*, is, to have *something* in it, *after another*; that is, to have *Part* of what it is to have, *after Part*; and this belongs most manifestly to *Body*; the *Contradictory*, or, to have *all* it is to have *at once*, must properly belong to a *Pure Spirit*, or an *Angel*. Again; Since an *Instant*

is an *Indivisible*, and one *Indivisible* added to another, cannot possibly make any greater Quantity, Length, or (as we may say) *Exporrection* of *Duration*; or, (which is the same,) any *Duration* corresponding to any least part of our *Time*; 'tis manifest that Angels can act as much in *One Instant*, as, in *Two*, or more; their being *more*, not affording them *longer Leisure* to Consider, or Resolve; whence, they are never the worse accommodated to act thus in one *Instant*, than in *More*.

21. The Reason for this seemingly strange Position is grounded (as was now shewn) on the *Essential Differences* of *Body* and *Spirit*; and no less on the *Duration* peculiar to *Angels*, which Divines call *Æternity*; which, being of a Superiour Nature to that of *Time*, does comprehend and centre in it self all the several Differences of our Fleeting *Time*, and, after an Eminent Manner, includes, and is Equivalent to them all: Not by way of Commensuration, (which can onely be found among *Quantitative Things*,) but by the Excellency it has above them. So that, as when an Angel operates upon any Body of a vast Extent, it is not *Diffus'd*, or *Extended*, according to the Extent of the Body it works upon; but, by its own *Indivisible* Nature, produces that *Divisible Effect*: so neither are its *Indivisible Operations*,

tions, tho' they be *Equivalent* to Innumerable ones, which are done *Successively* by us, perform'd by them *Successively*, or *One after Another*; but, according as the Nature of an Angel requires, *Indivisibly*, or *Instantaneously*: Yet, that Instant, being equivalent to *all our Time* here, contains in it *Thousands of Priorities of Nature*; nay, more, perhaps, than we can imagin; by which, *one* of them may be *conceiv'd* by our Reason to be *Originiz'd* from *another*. For Example; We can truly conceive them to *be*, or to have their *Essence and Existence*; and, consequently, to be *naturally Good*, as they came from *GOD's Immediate Hand*, ere their own *deprav'd Will* made them *Morally Bad*; because, according to *Priority of Nature or Reason*, *Being* must antecede their *Operating*, or making a *wrong Choice*. Also, for the same Reason, we conceive them to *know themselves*, their *own Dignity*, and *Man's Inferiority*; That one of these Men was to be set *above* them: be their *Head*, and *Ador'd* by them; That they took thence, out of their *Selfish Pride*, an *Aversion* against *GOD*, as the *Orderer* of it; and *Envy* against *Mankind*, as their *Competitor*; and against our *Blessed Saviour's Humanity*, as an *Usurper* over them: That, hence, they inspir'd other Angels to *rebel*; That they *contested* with *St. Michael*, and

were foil'd by him, &c. as is explain'd more largely in my *METHOD to SCIENCE*, p. 319. 320, 321, &c. where I conclude thus: [*All these may be conceiv'd to have Certain Priorities of Nature, as these Causes have to their Effects, which are in the same Instant. So that this single Instant of theirs, is, tho' not Formally, yet Virtually, and, in order to the many Indivisible Effects producible in it, as good as a long Series of our Time; not by way of Quantitative Commensuration of one to the other, but by the Eminency of the Angelical Duration, or their Æternity, which is of a Superiour Nature to Body, and, consequently, to Bodily Motion, or Time; and comprehends it all Indivisibly, or Instantaneously.*]

22. They who dislike this Discourse of mine, ought, if they would confute me, to shew that I do not, in it, hold Firmly to the Nature of the Thing, or Subject, in Dispute, and thence draw my Argument; but deviate from it: And, withall, they are to make it Evident to the Reader, that themselves do this, while they oppose me. But, I have the Misfortune to have to do with such Adversaries, who never in their Lives dreamt of any such Consideration; or so much as thought of any such Solid Ground: They never attend to the Nature of the Subject we are discoursing of, nor heed the Force of my Arguments, or my Premisses;

Premisses; but Manfully deny the Conclusions; deform them all they can; and then, most learnedly oppose them with Jest, Jeers, and fullome Railing. But to return to the Matter in hand:

23. Lest any should think it impossible, so many several Effects should be perform'd by an Angel in one Instant, and suspect it is some Whimsie of my own head, I desire them to reflect on what St. Thomas of Aquin (*Prima*, Q. 62. a. 4.) positively asserts, or rather lays for a Ground, viz. That the Angels, by one Act, and in the first Instant, did merit. Perhaps, I might here alledge, That, if in the first Instant they could merit, or chuse GOD for their True Last End, they might also, in the same Instant, chuse a wrong Last End, or Demerit, and so be damn'd. But I need not press it so far here: I only desire we may consider how many distinct Acts would pass in us, successively, ere we could be dispos'd for Heaven; which, in the Old Language of the Church, is call'd Meriting. Several Objects are propos'd to us, to chuse out of: Then we consider, or compare them; then we yield that this is more Agreeable to us, (thus affected, and circumstanc'd,) than the other; then we make choice of the one, and reject the other; then we resolve to pursue it; and, lastly, we set our selves to lay Means to compass it.

Now,

Now, all these are, according to this great Divine, perform'd by an Angel, in one *Instant*; tho' there be evidently Priority of *Nature* or *Reason* of the fore-going Acts; to the following ones: and, therefore, that the Angels must necessarily, in the *same Instant*, (it being suppos'd by us the *First*,) know their own *Nature*, their *Existence*, what is *Agreeable* to that Nature, and all the Train of Motives that conduce to the *Determination* of their *Wills*; without which, there can be no *Merit*. By which, Mr. Le Grand (who understands no more of those hard Points, than a Child does *Algebra*) may see they may have that which we call *Deliberation* and *Determination* in the first Instant, without needing Succession of *Time* to it, as he seems to imagine. Nay, the same Learned Doctor affirms, that Angels are *happy by one only Operation*; which includes, virtually, Millions, nay, Innumerable, of our Knowledges. These are strange *Paradoxes* to Mr. Le Grand's Merry-man, and such Men of Fancy; yet, we see this Great and Profound Speculater asserts them for *Truths*.

24. I know the same Holy Man holds the contrary Opinion to that which, in this Point, I think most reasonable; nay, which, I see, follows out of the Grounds lately mention'd, which *himself* had laid. For,



For, if they may have *so many Operations* in the First Instant, (subsequent to one another, in the Order of Nature,) why not more? What can stint them to such a precise Number? But, 'tis to be noted, First, That in the place cited, (*Q. 63. Art. 5. corp.*) he affirms, with *St. Austin*, that this Opinion I follow does not induce the *Manichean Heresie*, because it makes them not *Bad by their Nature*, but by the *Depravity* of their own *Free-Will*: Which evinces, there is nothing *against Faith* in it; nor would he have pass'd it over so unconcernedly, had it been so. Next, speaking of the Opinion I maintain, he says, *Quidam posuerunt, &c. Some Divines maintain'd, &c.* Which shews, that there have been divers Learned Men of that Opinion formerly. Thirdly, He confutes those who gave this for their Reason why it was impossible, because two Operations could not be terminated in the same Instant; and tells them, That this Reason holds only in those Agents which work by Local Motion; but, that it may well be thus in Operations which are *Instantaneous*; and, that in *these*, there may be, in one Instant, the *Terminus* of the *First* and *Second Operations*. Lastly, The Reason for which only that Great Man dissents from those who held our Opinion, is grounded on that Maxim of *Aristotle*, That the Gene-

rants,

*runs*, or he that gives *Being*, gives also the *First Operation*; which, in the Devils being *Sinful*, cannot therefore be in the *First Instant*; lest it should make *GOD* the *Author of Sin*. Which Reason does not convince me, or seem to conclude. For, First, However this may hold in *Natural Agents*, for which only *Aristotle* did certainly intend it as a *Maxim*; yet, I see not how the Parity holds in those Agents which have *Free-Will*; for, the Operations of such Agents are not purely refunded into *GOD*, but partly into *themselves*, who are the *Producers* of them; nay, wholly, as far as they are *Defective*. Secondly, The First Natural Operation of an Intellectual Creature, is, to know her own *Essence*, at least (in Souls) their own *Existence*; and, by them, all other Things which may be known by it, according as its Nature and Circumstances require; and this is given her by the First Cause, who gave them their Natures. But, there are many other Operations, subsequent to one another in Posteriority of Nature, (as is explain'd above,) which may be all perform'd in the First Instant, as *St. Thomas* himself, above-cited, has declar'd; and, among them, the *Choice* made by their *Free-Will*: Nor does any Reason appear, why all these thus subsequent Operations should be *ingenerated* in them, by the  
the

the Giver of their Being ; much less, why those *Defective* Operations, which have a Natural Dependence on others, should be refunded into GOD.

25. Let us pass on now to *Souls separated*, which die with some Venial Impurity in them, or (as St. James calls it) with *Sins not unto Death*, and therefore need *Purging* ; nor can be sav'd, but by *Fire*. Mr. Le Grand puts it upon me, that I hold them *Immutable* in their *Intermediate* State, as *Angels* are. I would ask him, how he knows I hold that Opinion, since I have never declar'd in my Writings that I hold it. Wherefore, the putting it upon me, who no where assert it, is Unfair, Uncivil, Captious, and Invidious. I have shewn, indzed, (*Id. Cart. p. 58.*) that his Arguments against it, do not conclude. So did St. Thomas, in the place now cited, oppose the *Inconclusiveness* of the Reason brought against his own Opinion ; and, yet, *himself* held that Opinion of his notwithstanding. He will say, the same Argument concludes equally for Angels and Them : But he will be hard put to it, to prove it. The *Soul* had its *Being*, by reason of the Dispositions in the *Embryo*, requiring such a *Form* as Nature could not give. It is the *Form* of the Body, and naturally requires, to act with it. It had its *Education* (as we may say) in the Body ;  
for

for it receiv'd its Spiritual Growth in Knowledge, by means of Bodily Impressions on the Senses. It is *Unactive* when the Body is out of Order. It has naturally a dear Love for it; procures its Good, grieves when it is hurt, and has a kind of Horrour to part with it. Nay, it retains a *Hankering* after it, after it has parted with it; insomuch, that even the Greatest Saints have not the perfect Consummation of their Bliss, till they get their Bodies again at the Resurrection; and, *magis est Anima ubi amat quam ubi animat*. Lastly, Those Imperfect Souls carry some Bodily Affections along with them. Hence, F. Seraphinus Caponi, in his *Elucidationes Formales*, Q. 76. Art. 1. says, the Soul is always united to the Body, *vel actu, vel inclinatione naturali*; either *Actually*, or by its *Natural Inclination*: And he gives for his Reason, *Aut ergo aptitudine saltem unitur tali materiae, aut non est Anima; sed semper est Anima, ergo, &c.* Either the Soul then is, by her Aptitude at least, united to the Body, or it is not a Soul: But it remains always a Soul, &c. The contrary to all which Particulars is found in an *Angel*. Now, what Con-natural Dispositions to Mutability these Considerations may give to a Soul, rather than to an *Angel*, I have not speculated so deep upon that Point, as to determine; which made me pitch upon an *Angel*, rather

ther than a *Soul*, when I advanc'd that Demonstration. And, had I spoke of a *Soul* expressly, own'd its *Immutability* as my *Tenet*, and gone about to defend it, I do not doubt but so to explain my Sentiment in that Point, as will give no Offence to any sober Man, nor any who is not resolv'd to remain unsatisfy'd.

26. The next pretended Bug-bear, is, the Impossibility of Annihilation; which I prove thus:

27. 1. Every Cause acts according as it is, or according to its Nature; at least, it cannot act *contradictorily* to its own Essence. But Annihilation is the putting of *Nothing*, or *Not-being*; which is Diametrically Opposite to GOD's Nature, which is *Pure Existence*: Therefore Annihilation cannot be caus'd by GOD.

28. 2. Every *Active* Power, (as Omnipotence is,) even tho' Infinite, is for some *Action*: But Annihilation is no *Action*; therefore it cannot proceed from GOD's Omnipotence. That Annihilation is no *Action*, I prove thus: That which is no *Species*, or no Sort of Action, is no *Action*; But Annihilation is no *Kind*, or *Sort*, of Action; for, every Scholar knows that every Action is of such a *determinate* Kind, because its *Terminus*, or *Effect*, is such or such; whereas, *Nothing* is no *Effect* at all, much less a *Determinate* one; but, in eve-

ry imaginable Respect, a Defect, and Indeterminate. Therefore, Annihilation is no Action; nor, consequently, can it be perform'd by an Active Power, as Omnipotence is; and, therefore, it argues no Power at all; and, which follows, 'tis rather an Impotency, or Want of Active Power, than Omnipotence; because that Active Power which can have no such Action proceeding from it; or, (which is the same,) an Active Power which cannot *Work* or *Act*, is so far Impotent; which cannot be said of GOD's Omnipotence.

29. 3. To be Creator of all Things, or Giver of Being, is (as our Creed teaches) one of GOD's Attributes: But it is unheard of, that to be Uncreator, or Destroyer, of Things, was ever attributed to GOD; or, that Contradictory Attributes could be peculiarly Appropriated to him; as my Adversaries hold there can, while they deny both Creating, and Uncreating, or Annihilating, to be Possible to any, but to GOD; that is, Peculiar to him.

30. It will be said, that Annihilation is perform'd by Suspension of GOD's Positive Action of Creating, or Giving Being. But this seems more Unconsonant than the former: For,

31. 4. Suspension (if it have any Sense) means, the Action of Suspending; especially, being put by them to be only performable

formable by GOD's *Omnipotence*, which is an *Active* Power; and this Action must have its Effect upon that which is *Suspended*, making it, of *Not-suspended*, to become *Suspended*; that is, *Chang'd*. But, that which is here *Suspended*, is GOD's Power of giving *Being*. Wherefore, this Tenet of *Suspension* puts a kind of *Passive* Power in GOD, receiving this Action, or Effect of *Suspension*; which makes Him, who is *Essentially Immutabile*, to be *Mutabile*; Neither of which themselves will say.

32. 5. That Actuality is not Infinite, which is not actually *Exercis'd*, or produces not actually the Effect peculiar to it, when the Subject is *Dispos'd* to receive its Influence, and it self is intimately *Apply'd* to it. But the *Ens*, or *Thing*, suppos'd to be Annihilated, was equally *Dispos'd*, or *Capable to be*, in the Instant it is suppos'd to be Annihilated, as it was *before*; and the Cause, by GOD's *Omnipresence*, was intimately *Apply'd*, and yet the Effect, or *Being*, was not put; therefore the Cause it self was not Infinitely Actual, as it was before; which is impossible to be thought. Note, that to an Infinite Actuality, it is requisite, and necessary, that it be (all other Requisites being put) actually *Exercis'd*; For, Actual Exercise being the most Formal Notion of *Pure Actuality*, it follows,



follows, that it is not Infinite if it be *stinted*, or fails *precisely on its Part*, of being *Exercis'd*, when all other Requisites are put.

32. 6. The same may be deduc'd from GOD's Infinite Goodness; which consists in his being (as far as is of it self) *Communicative* of Goodness and Being when the Subject is capable, and his Wisdom sees it best; by which only it is *stinted*. This is so certain a Truth, that, in such Cases, (as Divines shew,) even in *Supernaturals*, 'tis the *Incapacity* of Wicked Souls, putting an Obstacle to the ever-ready Influence of Heavenly Grace, that suspends it from working in such Corrupt and Indispos'd Hearts: Whence, as soon as, by their sincere *Repentance*, that Obstacle is *taken off*, they receive again the Supernatural Influence of the Holy Ghost, and the Gift of Divine Love. And this is so constant a Doctrine of the Church, that never did the most Sceptical Divine question or fancy that it could become GOD's Goodness to *suspend* the Influence of Grace to such Penitents; but rather, they oft-times receive it in a greater Measure, according to that Saying of our Saviour, (*Luke 7. 47.*) *Cui minus dimittitur, minus diligit: He to whom less is forgiven, loves less.* Whence also, upon their hearty Repentance, (which includes a Will to do what

GOD

GOD and his Church enjoin,) the Officers of the Church are bound to *Absolve* them, or admit them to the Participation of the Sacrament of Love; by which they are spiritually restor'd to the *Communion* of Christ's true Members, Vertuous Souls. Hence I argue: The Creature suppos'd to be Annihilated, was equally capable to receive Being at the Instant in which 'tis suppos'd to be Annihilated, as *before*; and GOD's Exuberant and Infinite Goodness cannot but be *Equally* ready to communicate Goodness, or Being, to his poor, Indigent Creatures, as it was formerly; therefore, the same Effect, or Continuation of Being, must follow; and, consequently, there can be no Annihilation.

34. The same is deduc'd from that Supremely wise Saying, grounded on GOD's Infinite Actuality, and Goodness, [*Dona Dei sunt absque penitentia: The Gifts of GOD are without Repentance.*] Which signifies, that, Let not the Creature change, and GOD is still immutably the same; and so, the same Effect must still follow. Nay, the Diversity of the Divine Attributes that respect us, is wholly grounded on the various Disposition of the Creatures. So that the same Ill Accidents are *Mercies* to good Souls, and serve to try, purifie, and improve them in Vertue, and thence, increase their Reward in Heaven; which,

which, to obstinately *Wicked* Souls, who are *not* Dispos'd to make good Use of them, is truly call'd an Effect of his *Justice*; vexing them here by Comfortless *Irresignation*, and *Sinful Repining* at *GOD's Chastisement*; and, so, tending to increase their Torments in the next World. Wherefore, as was said, by *Parity*, the *Disposition* of the *Creature* being the *same*, and *GOD* being *Unchangeably the same* also, the *same Effect* will follow. Nor can it be, that any *Creature* should be *Annihilated*.

35. The same is evinc'd from *GOD's* Attribute of *Wisdom*, or *Knowledge*, by which he made the World. To understand the following Discourse, we are to reflect upon that admirably profound Saying of *St. Austin*, (*Conf. cap. ult.*) *Nos itaque quæ fecisti videmus, quia sunt; Tu autem quia vides ea, sunt: VVe see (or know) Creatures, because they are; But thy Seeing (or Knowing) them, is the Cause, or Reason, that they are.* Which amounts to this, That *GOD* gains not his *Knowledge* of *Creatures* from their *Being* so as he sees them to be, as we do; but his *Seeing*, or *Knowing*, them to be fit for the *Best Order* of the World, which his *Infinite Wisdom* had *Determin'd*, *gives*, or *makes*, them to be. By which *Metaphysical*, or rather *Divine Maxim* of this *Learned and Holy* Father,

Father, it follows, that GOD leaves off to *know* a Creature at the Instant it is Annihilated: And, consequently, since this Knowledge of his is not taken from the *Existence* of the Creature, (which is *Extrinsic* to him,) nor depends on it, but on *himself*; it should follow, that GOD, by Annihilating a Creature, becomes *Intrinsically* Chang'd; which is impossible.

36. The same is prov'd from GOD's Attribute of *Justice*. For, if any *One* Creature can be Annihilated, *All of them* may; since 'tis granted by both Parties, that they do, all of them, *Entirely* and *Equally* depend on the Divine Goodness, for their Existence. Let us put then two Souls to be Annihilated; the one of which, by loving GOD heartily, is, at the Hour of Death, perfectly Dispos'd for its Glorious Reward in Heaven: The other dies obstinately, and Devilishly Wicked: It is manifest, that neither that *Holy* Soul will ever be Rewarded, nor the *Wicked* one Punish'd, in case they be Annihilated. But, this is against GOD's *Justice*; Therefore it cannot be done.

37. In a Word; Let them explicate *Suspension* as they will, and assign it for the Cause of Annihilation, it makes GOD the Cause of *no Effect*; that is, to be *no Cause*, which destroys their own Position: Nay, it makes him the Cause of the *worst Defect*

Defect imaginable ; or rather, of *Pure Defect* ; for, *Nothing*, or *Not-being*, is *such* ; to put which upon GOD, who is *Pure Actuality*, and, therefore, a Cause (as far as concerns himself) ever *Actually Working*, is (to speak with the least) a strange Tenet. If they mean only to say, that *Creatures depend every Moment on GOD*, for their *Being* ; or, that, if, *per impossibile*, he should suspend his *Acting*, they would no longer *be*, I do heartily agree with them ; for this is Agreeable both to the *Self-Existence* of GOD, and the *Nothingness* of *Creatures*, of themselves : But, if they contend it is an *Act* of his *Power*, or *Omnipotence*, (the Notion of which is manifestly relative to its *Effects*, that is *Active*, or *Effective* of *Something*,) *actually* to execute this, or, that it consists with his *Divine Attributes* ; they must bring very strong Arguments to prove it, ere I shall think fit to yield it ; whereas, hitherto they have brought *none at all*, but *Merry-man's* silly Explication of a Glass falling down, and breaking, if he takes away his Hand ; which the weak Fop thinks is a rare Argument : Whereas, it is demonstrable in *Physicks*, that the Glass would stand for *Eternity* where his Hand left it, if there were no *Positive Action* of a Cause impelling it downwards, *viz.* (the Descent of the Atmosphere ; ) which kind of *Positive Action* is *here wanting*.

38. They

38. They will object, that GOD is a *Free Agent*, and so may chuse whether he will sustain Creatures in Being, or no. But those weak Divines take the Notion of *Freedom* from the Folly of Creatures; which is this, that we can, out of *Humour*, do, and undo Things at our pleasure, whether it agrees with *True Reason*, which is our *Nature*, or no. Whereas, *True Freedom* does not consist in a foolish *Humour-someness*, or in the *doing* and *undoing* Things, as the *Toy* takes us; but in this, that, *Unforc'd*, and *Unconstrain'd*, by any thing which is *without us*, we determine our selves according to the Inclination of our true *Nature*, *Reason*; and, when we do otherwise, we are less *Free*; or *Slaves* to some *Passion* which impels us, and makes us deviate from the Propensions we have by our *True Nature*, to do what is *Rational*. Wherefore, GOD's *Freedom* consists in this, that he is *Essentially Self-determin'd* to act according to his own *Nature*, and to his own *Attributes*, which are *Essential* to his *Nature*. Since, then, it has been shewn, that to *Give Being* is *Agreeable* to GOD's *Essence*, which is *Self-Existence*, and to his *Attributes*, he is more *Free* for his being thus *Self-determin'd* to give Being to such Creatures as his *Wisdom* sees fittest for the best Order of his World; and, that, to do otherwise, or to

*Annihilate*, is to be *less Free*, because it is less according to his *Essence*, and *Attributes*; which is, not to be every way *Perfect*, and *Infinitely* such.

39. I must confess, it seems very *Indecent*, and *Shocking*, to Pious Ears, to say that GOD cannot do *this*, or cannot do the other: But the School-men, in their Disputes, first brought that Expression into Custom; and, tho', following them, I have sometimes us'd it, yet I have endeavour'd to *soften* and *explicate* it so, as it may not breed any Offence. Hence, in my *METHOD*, pag. 363. I have these Words, [It is generally more Safe, more Edifying, and more Proper, to say, in such Cases, [It cannot be that GOD should will such a thing.] than bluntly to say [GOD cannot do it:]] For, This flatly limits Omnipotence; That only restrains its Acting *hâc & nunc*, because of some Attribute of the Divine Nature, to which it is Disagreeable.] Hence, also, I affirm, (*Id. Cartes. p. 61.*) That it sounds the same among Philosophers, to say, [GOD cannot do it,] as to say, [The Thing is a Contradiction, or Impossible:] Possibility being the Object of all Power, even tho' Infinite.] And, to render it still the more Inoffensive, and to prevent all Cavil against my Doctrine, I added; [When Philosophers affirm any thing is Possible, or Impossible, they regard only the present



*present State of the World, and the Order of Second Causes.*] So that this Phrase, according to my Doctrine, amounts to no more but this; That it is beyond the Power of *Second Causes*, as carry'd on by GOD's Ordinary Providence, to effect it; as I have also explain'd my self, in my *METHOD*, long ago, in the place lately cited. Which *Innocent and Common Doctrine* my Maligners do character to be, *the Running down all Piety, Religion, and GOD himself*: Which shews, their *Dregs of Common Sense* run very low, though their Malice flies the *highest Pitch of Slander, and Calumny*. To finish this Discourse, let them bring Solid Arguments to prove Annihilation Agreeable to GOD's *Self-Existence, his Pure Actuality*, and the rest of his *Attributes*; and they shall see how readily I will embrace their other-wise-Groundless Opinion. But, alas poor *Triflers!* they never set themselves to bring any *Demonstrative or Conclusive Argument*, either *pro, or con*, in their Lives. They talk Big, and, perhaps, sprinkle their Assertion with some Slight, Insignificant *Explanation, or Untoward Parallels*; and supply the Defect of Reasoning, with *Feering, and Railing* against what either their Short Capacities do not reach to understand, or their Resolute Insincerity will not let them acknowledge, tho' they know it.

40. But, now comes an Objection of weight: *Spondanus* tells us, (he says,) that *It was one of Wickleff's Errours, Condemn'd in the General Council of Constance, by a perpetual Decree, That GOD could not Annihilate.* This looks Great, and Mighty. But, why does he not relate this *Perpetual Decree* of the Council, in its own Words, if there be any such? Is not the Council it self extant? Or, is *Spondanus's* Relating it more Authentick than the Words of the Council *it self*? Why does he not tell us then, out of the Acts of the Council, in what Sense, and under what Terms, *Wickleff* propos'd it: In what Words, and in what Sense, that Council condemn'd it? Or, whether it were more express than that of *Joannes Thessalonicensis*, in the Second Council of Nice, *That 'tis the Sentiment of the Church, (that is, the General Opinion,) that Angels have thin Bodies of Air, or Fire?* The contrary to which, for all that, the best Catholick Divines do now publicly teach. Lastly, If this be a Point of Faith, (as they would have it thought,) why is not this press'd home against me? This would knock me down at one Blow; and there would need no paltry Jeers, Flours, or Falsifications, to do that Job, which is their only Aim. The Reader may be sure they are conscious there is some great Flaw in this Objection, that they

they are so favourable to me, in thus *barely* and *crudely* Alledging it. But, what is all this to me? It is a common Doctrine, taught openly in the Schools, That this is not performable by GOD's *Ordinary Power*; and, I have already shewn, out of express Words, both in my *METHOD*; and in my later Books, that I speak of no other Power. So that, either I am no *Wickleffist* for maintaining it; or, I have enow of very honest Brother-Hereticks; who maintain publicly the same, and, yet, are not ill look'd upon for it by the Church: Which being manifestly so, it would be worth our Consideration to find the Reason, why our Libelling *Merry-man*, whose Ironies are Sarcasms; and, who pretends Mirth, to cloak his Uneasie Malice, does let *all those* Divines alone who hold the *same* that I do, and fall upon *me only*. But those Men had not challeng'd the *Cartesians* to produce Principles for their New-fangl'd Doctrine; in which consists my peculiar Heresie, which blows their *Zeal for Faith* into such a *Flame*.

41. I wish the *Cartesians*, who make the Soul and Body *two Things*, because they are two distinct *Natures*, could as well clear themselves of speaking inconsequently in Matters belonging to *Faith*, as I have done: For, by making them *two Things*, and, consequently, *Individual*

*Things*, each of those Things must have its peculiar Determinations, Modes, or Complexion of Accidents, *constituting* it an Individual Thing, which are *sustained* by those *Things*, as their *Subject*; which is the very Notion of a *Suppositum*. There are therefore, and must be, Two *Supposita* in Christ, as long as those two Natures remain in his Humanity; that is, *for ever*. To which, add the *Divine Suppositum*, it must follow, that there are *Three Supposita* in Christ; which shocks Christian Faith. To those, Mr. Le Grand has given no Satisfactory Answer; nor can, unless he distinguishes the *Nature* from the *Suppositum*; which, if he does, then the *Suppositum* of every Man may have *Two Natures* in it; and so, the Soul and Body may compound *One Ens*, or *One Thing*: And, then, since 'tis *impossible*, and contradictory, they can be One and Two in the same Respect, or under the same Notion, it will follow, that *Man* need be no more than *One Thing*. They will, perhaps, say, they are One *Compound Thing*; but Two Simple Ones, or Two *Parts* of that Compound: But I have taken off, and shewn, the Weakness of that Distinction, *Id. Cart.* from p. 241. to p. 248. and shewn, that an *Ens*, or *Thing*, is, *That which is capable of Existing*: Wherefore, each of those we call *Parts*, if they be *Things*, are capable of Existing alone,

alone, when separated ; which cannot be True of the *Body*, which is a Distinct Thing when Separated, (*viz.* a Dead Carcass,) and not the same Thing, with the same Nature, much less the same *Existence* it had: Nay, a *Compleat* Thing too ; because, That is *completely* a Thing, which wants nothing to make it *Capable of Existing* ; and, if it wants that, it is not a Thing at all. But, what enforces farther, this Objection is, That'tis defin'd in the Council of *Vienna*, under Pope *Clement V.* that the *Rational* or *Intellectual Soul* is the *Form* of the *Body*. The Words are these ; [*Doctrinam omnem seu positionem, temerè asserentem aut vertentem in dubium quòd Substantia Animæ Rationalis seu Intellectualis verè ac perfectè Humani Corporis non sit Forma, velut Erroneam, ac veritati Christianæ Fidei inimicam, hoc Sacro approbante Consilio, reprobamus. Definientes, ut cunctis nota sit sinceræ Fidei Veritas, quòd quisquam deinceps asserere, defendere aut tenere pertinaciter præsumpserit, quòd Anima Rationalis seu Intellectualis non sit Forma Corporis Humani per se & essentialiter, tanquam Hereticus sit censendus.* Here we see all those condemn'd for *Hereticks*, who say, or hold, that the *Intellectual Soul* is not the *Form* of the *Body* ; and, that the Opinion it self is stigmatiz'd with the Brand of being an *Enemy* (that is, *Destructive*, or *Pernicious*) to

*the Truth of Christian Faith.* Now, if the Soul be the *Form* of the *Body*, then the *Body* is the *Matter* of that *Form*; And then, let all the *Divines* in *G O D's* Church judge, whether the *Matter* and *Form* can be *Two Things*, since they all hold, that the *Matter* and *Form* make up *One Thing*. Did ever any *Solid Man* hold, that the *Matter* or *Form* either, singly consider'd, are *Things*, or any thing else than *Parts* of a *Thing*? Or, can we think that those *Definers* meant by the Word [*Form.*] the same that is meant by the Word [*Thing?*] Whenas, all the *Learned World*, before *Cartesius's* Time, held, that the *Form* was no more but that *Actuating* or *Determining Part* which, by *informing* the *Matter*, constituted the *Thing*. The *Cartesians* will tell us, that it informs the *Matter*, according to the *Notion* of *Action*: But the *Council* has fore-stall'd that *Evasion*, as if it had fore-seen it, by the Word [*Essentialiter;*] by which signal and cautious Expression, it declares it to be *Heretic*, to say, it does not *Essentially* inform the *Body*, or according to the *Notion* of *Ens*, or *Thing*, (and not *Active*, or *Co-active*, only;) that is, it makes the *Matter* become *Humanum Corpus*, and *Homo* to be *One Ens*, or *Thing*, (to use *St. Athanasius's* Words.) *Ex Animâ Rationali & Humanâ carne subsistens*. I do not here accuse the *Intention* of the  
Car-

*Cartesians*; but I see plainly, that their New Notions, or *Ideas*, will never agree with the Explications which former Divines make of Christian Faith; much less, help them with *better*; or, indeed, with *any*. But, to return to our Subject:

42. Let us sum up this Tenet of theirs, concerning Annihilation, and see what Work they have made of it, according to the Lights *Nature* and *Art*, working upon our *Natural* Notions, have given us. First, They make it belong to GOD's *Omnipotency*, for which Attribute alone they seem zealous; for, I do not see that, in discoursing this Point, they even think of, or regard, his *Self-Existence*, which is his *Essence*, or his *Goodness*, his *Justice*, or any other Attribute of his; or pretend, in the least, it is Agreeable to *them*. Now, *Omnipotency* is a Power of doing *all* things; and they would make it a Power of *Not-doing*, or of *doing Nothing*, as to the Things Annihilated, to which *only* it relates.

2. *Omnipotency* is an *Infinite* Power, and withall, an *Active* Power, (for, I do not think they will put a *Passive* Power in GOD:) And, every *Active* Power is essentially such, because it can have such an *Action*. Yet, Mr. Le Grand, in his Preface, p. 36. seems to grant, that Annihilation is not the *Action* of any Power; nor, indeed, such a *Power*; they being, as I al-



ledg'd, specify'd by their Objects: To which he answers, *Rectissime*! So that here we have an *Active Power* working, without an *Action* answering to it; or an *Omnipotent Power*, (to which they ascribe that Effect,) which may be *Deny'd* to be *such a Power*; or, (which is the same,) he makes that a *Power*, which is *no Power*. 3. They say, 'tis done by *Suspension*: Well then; this belonging, as they say, to GOD's Omnipotency, which is an *Active Power*, this *Suspension* must, for the Reason given, be an *Action*. No, say they; 'tis *no Action*, but a *Cessation* from *Action*. Now, that *not Acting* should belong to Omnipotency; or, that the *Action* of *Suspending* his *Power*, should be an *Action* of *that Power*, gives us a Second Bull of the largest Size. 4. *Suspension* must either have some Effect, or no Effect: If *none*, 'tis to *no purpose*; If *any*, it must be in GOD; for, 'tis his *Power* that *Acted before*, and is now *Suspended*: But, this puts a *Passive Power* in GOD; which is a higher Strain of Nonsense, than either of the former. No, say they; the Effect is upon the Creature *Annihilated*; But this is as nonsensical as the former; for, Common Sense tells us, that *Suspension* has its *proper Effect* upon that which is *Suspended*, which is GOD's *Conservative Action*: Nor is the Existence of the Creature, in good Sense, *Suspended*;

ded ; for, that which is only Suspended, remains still, tho' in *Suspense* ; whereas, the Creature remains not at all, being Annihilated. Yet, grant the Existence of the Creature could be said to be Suspended ; still, GOD's Conservative Action, which made it *be*, must, in Priority of Nature, be suspended *it self*, ere its Existence could be suspended, or it self cease to be. But, waving this, let us see where this Effect is, which terminates this Action of *Suspension*. In the Creature, say they : And, what can we conceive to be in the Creature when it is *Annihilated*, which is the *Effect* of this Action, and terminates it ? Why, to become *Nothing*. Now, *Nothing*, or *Not-being*, is a pure *Defect* ; nay, infinitely, or in every imaginable Regard, *Defective* ; and so can be *no Effect*, for this has something *Positive* in its Notion. The last thing, therefore, they can possibly alledge, is, That *Suspension* is *no Action*. For Answer to which, we must turn them over to School-Boys, who can tell them, that *Suspendo* is a *Verb Active*, has a *Transitive* Signification, and must have an *Accusative Case* after it. The Question, then, is, What is this *Accusative Case* ? Or (which is the same,) What is this Thing which is Suspended ? Which we have already shewn, can with no Sense either be GOD, or the Creature ; that is, *Nothing* is suspended ;

pended; and, therefore, this Suspension is no Suspension. So that, which way soever they turn and wind themselves, their own Contradictions still meet them in the Face, and confound them. And so much of this Point, which is only therefore scandalous, because 'tis unsutable to *Fancy*; that Faculty, which, if solely attended to, leads all its Followers into *Folly* and *Nonsense*.

43. Another *Impiety* of mine against GOD, is, That I will not allow that Thesis of *Cartesius*, (for, we are to suppose, that all his Conceits, tho' never so Groundless, are Gospel with these Men,) that GOD is the *Immediate Cause of Motion*; the Denial of which does ravel the Scheme of that *Hypothesis*. Hence Mr. *Le Grand* infers, that I deny GOD to be the *First Mover*: Whereas, (to short is his Reasoning Faculty,) the direct contrary follows: For, he who only denies that GOD is the *Immediate Cause of Motion*, does, even by doing this, imply that he is the *Mediate, Remote and Principal Cause* of it; as giving Angels, his Ministering Spirits, both the *Power* to move Matter; and, withal, moving them to move it, by *Spiritual Motives*, or Manifestations, of the Wise Decrees of his Divine Providence, how he would have it done. Thus, all *Instrumental Causes* are the *Immediate Causes*

ses of *every* Effect in Nature. Will he say, that this is *Impiety against GOD*; or, that it debars Him from being the *Principal Cause*! Does not Fire *immediately* burn us? Water wet us? Or, Will any but a Mad-man say, that GOD is the *Immediate Cause* of that Burning, or Wetting? Or, that this hinders Him from being the *Principal Cause* of all the Effects in Nature, who gives them *Power* to produce those Effects, and *Premoves* or *Applies* them to produce them? Does not the Denial of this make all *Second Causes Useless*? How shallow, then, is this ridiculous Objection! Wherefore, let them either shew that Angels, which are of a *Superiour Nature* to Matter, and are *Pure Acts*, have not *Power* to act upon it, or move it; or, that it becomes the Sublimeness of the Divine Majesty, to put his *Immediate Hand* to such mean and low Effects that his *Servants* have a *Power* to produce them; or, that this *Power* was given them by Him, to remain *Useless*, and *Unemploy'd* about its Proper Objects: or, let them grant that *Angels*, or (which is the same) *GOD*, by his Angels, gives Motion to Matter. Again, to omit many other Arguments; That which *GOD* does *Immediately* by *Second Causes*, is *according to Nature*; but, what he does *immediately* by *Himself*, is *Miraculous*, and *Instantaneous*, as coming from an *Activity*,

vity, whose *Infinite Power* no *Indisposition* on the Creature's side can check, and retard. Did GOD move Matter, when (as they hold) he divided it into greater Lumps at first, *Instantaneously*; whenas, it is not Motion, unless it have *part after part*; or, unless it be *Successive*? Would these Men but please to leave guiding their Thoughts by the hasty Sallies of their *Fancy*, and regard deliberately the Natures of the Things we are discoursing of, that is, the Nature of GOD, who is *Pure Self-Existence*; the Nature of an *Angel*, and the Nature of *Matter*, and build their Discourses from those Grounds, we might hope, in time, for some Sense from them: But that is too Solid for them; it will not give their Fancy Leave to range, and take Vagaries in the Air, but holds them in too strictly; and, therefore, 'tis not *their way*. Yet, something must be said; and, therefore, *Ill Language* must supply the place of *Sense* and *Solidity*.

44. But, Gentlemen, to what end were all these Objections huddl'd together, in their *Preface*, and *Dialogue*? These *Theses* are (except this last) altogether *Foreign* to what I oppos'd, and prov'd against *Cartesius* and Mr. *Le Grand*. What is *Annihilation* to *Cartesius's* Method to find out First Principles, by denying the *Certainty* of all his *Senses*? Or, What is the *Immutability*

*bility of a Pure Spirit*, to the Unaccountable Constitution of *Cartesius's* First Matter, which grounds all his *Physicks*; which they put neither to be Dense, nor Rare; Hard, nor Soft; Rough, nor Smooth; Solid, nor Fluid; Moist, nor Dry? &c. Again; If they would needs be meddling with Impertinent Questions, why were the *Reasons* for them *Suppress'd*, the *Conclusions* themselves most Learnedly *Deny'd*; and, this done, a Black Mark set upon them, at the pleasure of the Painter? Who sees not that this odd Prevarication, and untoward Management of it, does evidently bewray a Distrust of their Cause, and a perfect Despair of maintaining it? Who sees not, that, by their flinching thus from the Question, and haling in impertinent Points, which were odd to Vulgar Fancies, and were deny'd by other Divines, they hop'd (to save their own Bacon) to get those Men on their side, to make use of their Arguments, and of their (mis-called) Authority, to decry me, because they wanted Arguments of their own, to uphold the *Cartesian* Doctrine? Lastly, What is their Scurrilous Dialogue, to their producing, or so much as Naming, any one Principle of theirs; to do which, I had challeng'd them? Or, Why should this exasperate them to a Raving Extasie of *Railing*? Let them take their own New Method,

Method, unheard of amongst Learned Men, hitherto: Who can hinder them? But, if their Passion have but left them one single Grain of Prudence, they cannot but see that all *Civil Men* will hate their *Abusiveness*; all *Good Men*, their *Malice*; and all *Learned Men*, their *Folly* and *Ignorance*.

45. But, to take off the Edge, and blunt the Teeth of all their reproachful Calumnies, I have shewn, above §. 39. that what they object to me, if they will but truly represent my Doctrine, can dissatisfie no sober Man, even of their own Party; since, in the three first Points, which their Confus'd and Undistinguishing Anger strives to render so Invidious, I speak of GOD's *Ordinary Power*, or, of the Course of Causes, and the Nature of Things, as they come to our Knowledge by *Natural Means*, and are carry'd on by GOD's *Ordinary Providence*. What Philosopher, but a Mad-man, will say, he can fathom and comprehend all the *Supernatural Methods* and *Ways* which GOD's Infinite Wisdom can contrive, or his Almighty Power execute, when he shall please to work *miraculously*? He who is the Original Cause of those Natures, cannot he order them as he pleases, when His Wisdom, for Reasons inscrutable to the Greatest of his Creatures, sees it fit, to bring



bring about those Hidden Ends design'd by his Divine Decrees? Who can say, that, tho' *Angels* have no Means to *acquire* New Knowledges, and so ought, by their Nature, to have all the Knowledge they are capable of, *infus'd* into them at first; yet, that GOD, acting *miraculously*, cannot *de-tain* some Light from an Angel, and communicate it to him (as we conceive) *afterwards*? Who can say that GOD, if he pleases to alter the Course and Nature of Things, or to order the Circumstances of the next World, by Ways unknowable by us, cannot, by his *Miraculous* Power, effect, that Imperfect Souls may be releas'd from the Chains of their Captive State, and be reciev'd into Heaven before the Last Day? Or, Who dares contend, that his Divine Goodness, that oft-times does Stupendious Miracles for the Prayers of *one single Saint* on Earth, will not do *Miracles*, and this frequently, for the Prayers of his Spouse, the *Church*! Once more I do earnestly beg of Mr. *Le Grand*, it may be consider'd, that all our Science is built on the Nature of Things, *as they are in themselves*, and govern'd by GOD's Ordinary Power: 'Tis beyond the Skill and Sphere of Philosophy, even to *guess* at how many Miracles may be wrought upon the very least Thing in Nature: Nor did any Man, I know of, ever pretend to determine

mine any such Point; and I cannot but think it some kind of Neglect in them, not to declare as much. Miracle is beyond all Humane Science; *Eccē, DEUS vincens Scientiam nostram!* (*Job, ch. 36. 28.*) Which being my present Sentiment, and having ever been so; and, that Philosophers have nothing at all to do with the Subjects they treat of, as standing under GOD's Power working *Supernaturally*, and *Miraculously*; 'tis manifest, that all the Expressions I have any where, do still relate to his *Ordinary Power* only; nor can they be meant, or wrested by Malice it self, to be meant, of any other: And, tho' I may seem, in some extravagant Case, to doubt, because a Power that never Acted, seem'd *Useless*, and, so, was not an Attribute befitting GOD; yet, I no where assert that *Annihilation* is Impossible to GOD's *Miraculous Power*. Indeed, in case it be really against GOD's Attributes, I should not stick at all to say, it is *beyond Miracle*; yet, I no where maintain, that Infinite Wisdom may not *miraculously* contrive it so, if it sees it fitting to be done, that it *may not be* against his Attributes; tho' Things being left in their *Natural Condition*, it may truly be concluded to be opposite to GOD's Attributes administering the World after the *Ordinary Methods of Providence*: Which being so;  
and,

and, that I, as a Philosopher, speak of GOD's *Ordinary* Power only ; what is become of all their Calumnies, of which they are so-lavish? Why is my *Foot Cloven*? Why did *none but his Devil set me on writing*? Why do I *run down all Piety, Religion, and GOD himself*; as *Merry-Andrew*, their Buffoon, in his Hurry of Calumny, would assure his Reader, if any regarded him?

46. Convicted thus of rallying me so severely, and without the least Occasion, or Ground, since I say no more than other Divines in the Schools do, without any Control, maintain publicly; perhaps they may, for their Excuse, pretend very charitably, that they are heartily glad they have prevail'd with me, at length, to be a good Christian; and exult, (as their Fellow-Libeller, *Lomius*, did,) that they have brought me, with much ado, to retract my Unwarrantable Opinions. But, I am their humble Servant, and beg their Pardon; I have not seen one Argument of theirs, as yet, that could bring a Man, endow'd with Common Reason, to retract; no, nor hold any thing; but to be a Sceptick, and apprehend there is no Certainty in the World, seeing Men, who, as appears by their Carriage, are mighty Ambitious to be held Men of Knowledge, produce neither *Principles* to ground their Discourse, nor *Con-*  
*nexion*

*nexion*, to make the Parts of it hang together. What my Sentiment was formerly, as to this Point, I have told them often, ere this, (in my *Id. Cartes. p. 61.*) where I say, First, *Idem sonat apud Philosophos, &c.* It signifies the same among Philosophers, (especially Scholasticks,) to say, [GOD cannot do such a thing ;] as to say, [It is impossible to be done.] Next, That, when Philosophers pronounce any thing to be Possible, or Impossible, they have respect only to the present State of the World, and the Order of Second Causes. Thirdly, That, therefore, a Thing may be Contradictory, and Impossible, according to the Ordinary Course of the World, or to the Natures of Things, by which GOD, according to his Ordinary Providence, governs the World ; which, yet, according to his Supernatural and Miraculous Power, by which he subdues all things to himself, are Possible. Of which, I there brought divers Instances.

47. Perhaps too, they will say, that, by this Doctrine I abandon and give up all my Demonstrations ; and leave them to shift for themselves, or confess them to be *False*. I answer ; Not one jot : For, all Science regards its Objects only as they stand in *Nature*, and not under GOD's Miraculous Power, which orders or alters the Natures of Things as he sees fit. Thus, One perfectly Skilful in the Science

ence of *Physicks*, might demonstrate, that it was impossible a *Virgin* should *Conceive*; or, that *Clay*, temper'd with *Spittle*, should cure *Blindness*; yet, by *GOD's Miraculous Power*, both were done: Thus, a *Speculative* and *Learned Metaphysician*, before the *Incarnation* was *Reveal'd* to the *World*, might have brought most clear *Demonstrations* from his *Altissime Cause*, and the *Nature of GOD*, that it was *Impossible* *GOD* should be *Chang'd*, *Suffer*, or *Die*; (which, amongst other things, made the *Greeks* esteem *Christianity Foolishness*;) yet, *GOD's Infinite* and *Miraculous Wisdom* and *Goodness* could contrive a *Way*, how all those *Propositions* might be *Verify'd*. Which will make it less wonderful to us, that he can, if he sees fit, find *Ways* enow, which surmount our *Guess*, or *Imagination*, how a *Pure Spirit* may *Change*; *Souls* in the *Intermediate State* be deliver'd, or a *Creature* *Annihilated*, if his *Incomprehensible Wisdom* sees it fit. Whoever reflects seriously on those *Powerful* and *Emphatical Words*, [*Ecce, Nova facio omnia*, *Apoc. 21. 5.*] spoken by the *Great Restorer* of the *World*, and *Promoter* of all *Creatures*, and, amongst the rest, *Glorify'd Bodies*, to their *Utmost Perfection*, in their *Future* and *Eternal State*, will find in them *Matter enough* of *Contemplation*; and easily

easily apprehend that their Condition will be so alter'd for the *Best*, that, to our Low Conceits and Notions we have of them *now*, it would seem impossible for them to be such as we shall find them *then*. Indeed, I have not *expresly* put this Distinction formerly, because it was not necessary, nothing of that kind being then objected to me; yet, I had done this *Equivalently*, and in other Terms, by telling Mr. Le Grand, (Id. Cartes. p. 61.) that, *When Philosophers affirm any thing to be Possible, or Impossible, they regard the present State of the World, and the Order of Second Causes.* And, he is aware of it; for, in his *Censure*, p. 63. he would wave that Distinction, and seems willing to deny it; yet, is forc'd to admit it, by his Recurring to *Potentia Obedientialis* in Creatures; which is the same I express'd by *Quâ naturas Rerum sibi subdit*. But, to fix his Cavil upon me, he tells us, that *the Question is not, Quid Philosophi pronuntiant; sed, Quid ille statuit*: And, I do *statuere*, it cannot be done by GOD's Ordinary Power; and, that all the Notions we have of GOD, and his Attributes, by Natural Means, and *Acquir'd Learning*, (or *Philosophy*,) seem Opposit to it: But, I hold, notwithstanding, that, if GOD's *Wisdom* sees fit it should be done, the same *Wisdom* can contrive Ways how it may be done *Unknowable*, nay, not possible

possible to be *guess'd at*, by our Unelevated, and Infinitely Short *Natural Reason* inform'd by the Lights we have of him from Creatures; and that, what his Infinite *Wisdom* sees fit, and his *Will* ordains, his *Power* can execute. Which is what (applying my Words to this Particular) I call *Potentia Miraculosa*, or *Extraordinaria*. Nor do I any where say, that *GOD's* Wisdom, if he sees it Fit, cannot bring it about that it *may be* done, and yet, *not be* Prejudicial, or Contrary to any of those Attributes, from which, as far as known to us by Ordinary Means, I, as a *Philosopher*, ought to argue. And, it would be a Madness in either of us, to maintain, that *GOD's* Power is not beyond our foolish *Philosophy*, or the Reach of Knowledge, which Ordinary Means can afford us.

48. I do not doubt, but it will be deny'd by my Adversaries, that they have been so wanting to their Cause, as to maintain it only by *Bantering*, and *Railing*: They will say, (for, what will they not say, if *Saying* would do their Business?) that they have produc'd Arguments to prove their Doctrine, and have invalidated all mine. But, I deny that Mr. *Le Grand* has, in his *Censura*, even so much as given an Answer to any one of my Demonstrations; unless he thinks it is Answer sufficient to call them (as he does in his



his Epistle to the Reader) *Cavils*; and to tell him, according to his Way of *saying any thing*, that he has, *satis abunde*, reply'd to them. I must, I say, absolutely contest against him, that he has not produc'd *any one Conclusive Proof* for any one Tenet of his own, nor given *any one Solution* to any one Argument of mine, where I pretend to *Demonstrate*, as I do frequently. I know he mentions some Words pick'd out of them, and reflects on them with Jeers, or Jest; but, when he should come seriously to a Close Discourse with them, and either *admit* or *confute* the Connexion in which the Force of them consists, he is in a *Hurry*, and *Hast*, to be gone to *another Business*; (for, his whole Method here, is a *Wild* and *Distracted* Leaping from one thing to another;) and so, he fairly takes a *short Leave* of them, and away he is vanish'd. So that the Frame of his Discourse seems to be made up of little else but *Transitions*. And, as for his Proofs, he thinks it is enough to *say* a thing; and, 'tis a *Favdur* to the Reader, *now*, if he bestows so much as a *slight Explication* of any Point; of which, *formerly*, he was more free. He sometimes cites my Words at large, even a whole Page together; so that one would verily think he meant fully to confute me; but the Reader may easily see, it was only to make a Shew, and  
swell

swell his small Performances to the *just Size* of a *Treatise*: For, if we set aside the *Sarcasms*, *Ironies*, *sought Phrases*, quaint *Expressions*, pretty *Curiosities* and *Observations*, (to shew how profound a Man he is at *Note-Book-Learning*;) if we set aside these, with his *Angry Words*, and what he transcribes out of me, and others; and his Medly of little indifferent *Nothings*, which do not signify any thing, either *pro*, or *con*; and, look for what only should be expected from a *Philosopher*. *viz. Connected Sense*, grounded on *Principles*; and then go about to cast up the *Account* of them, the *Total Summ* would amount to nothing but a *long Row of Ciphers*. *Mediums* fit for *Demonstration*, or any thing that, even, favours of true *Logick*, are such *Strangers* to his *Loose Talk*, that the *Solid Sense* in it might be compriz'd in a *Nut-shell*; as will more amply appear hereafter.

49. To give farther Satisfaction, and, perhaps, some Benefit to the Reader, I will instance in one *Demonstration* of mine; and shew how empty Mr. *Le Grand's* Pretence is, that he has (as he phrases it,) *abundè satis*, answer'd my *Arguments*; and, how frivolous it would be in me, to lay open his *Incredible Weakness* in the rest of his *Imaginary Solutions* of my other *Demonstrations*: For, since I chal-

E

leng'd

I eng'd him, and the *Cartesians*, to give an Answer to *this* Argument, we may be sure he will exert his utmost to perform it punctually, and satisfactorily. Whence we may conclude, that if he most miserably *falls flat* in doing Right to himself, and his Cause, in *this*; it cannot be expected, but he will much more *fail* in all the rest; which is the only Reason why I pitch'd upon this in particular, as a Decisive *Index* of all his Atchievements of this kind. 'Tis mention'd above, §. 20. and I will repeat it in distinct Propositions; fetching it (perhaps, something needlessly) from Remotest Grounds; and, then, reducing each piece of it to *Self-Evidence*, both that the Force of it may the better appear to be Irresistible; as also, that Mr. *Le Grand* may consider which of the *Identical* Propositions he will, in his great Learning, think fit to *deny*. But, first; to avoid the Old Cavil, let it be remember'd, that we speak here, as Philosophers ought always to do, of the Nature of an Angel, *as in it self*, and not as it may be wrought upon by GOD's *Miraculous* Power, by which he disposes of all his Creatures, as he sees to be *Wiseest* and *Best* for *Supernatural* Reasons; which, as they are beyond the Science of Philosophers to *Know*, or even to *Guess at*; so, 'tis evidently beyond their Province to meddle with them.

THESIS:

## T H E S I S :

*An Angel, or Pure Spirit, is naturally Immutable.*

*Prop. 1.* **B**ody and Spirit, which are suppos'd, by the Question, to be the *Species*, or *Kinds*, of *Ens* or *Thing*, do agree, (or do not differ,) precisely, in the Common Notion of *Thing*. This is as self-evident, as that [*Every Thing is a Thing.*] Which is an *Identical*.

*Prop. 2.* Therefore, they only *Disagree*, or *Differ*, by those Notions, call'd, their *Differences* : For, since, to *have a Difference* in it from another, is the *Formal Reason*, why one *is Different*, or *Differs*, from another ; as, *Whiteness* in a *Thing*, is the *Formal Reason* which makes a *Thing* *be white* ; it follows, that [*to have Differences* in them, is, *to Differ*,] is as *Self-evident*, as 'tis, that [*to Differ*, is, *to Differ*.] Which is an *Identical*.

*Prop. 3.* Therefore, those *Things* which have *Greater* (or *more Opposite*) *Differences* in them, do *more differ* ; and those which have the *Greatest* (or *most Opposite*) *Differences* in them, do *most differ* : For, since, to *have a Difference* from another, is the same as *to Differ* from it, by *Prop. 2.* this Proposition is as *Evident*, as it is, that

[*Those which do more Differ, do more Differ*;] or, [*Those which do most Differ, do most Differ.*] Which are Identicals.

Prop. 4. *Divisible* and *Indivisible* do Adequately Divide the Common Notion of Thing, as its Differences. For, since [*Divisible*] means [*Not-Divisible*,] which is Contradictory, that is, *most Opposite* to, or *most Different* from the other; and, between Contradictories, (or, *is*, or *is not*,) there can be no Third, or Middle Notion; this Proposition is as Self-evident, (by Prop. 3.) as 'tis, that (*Those which do most Differ, do most Differ.*) Which is an Identical.

Prop. 5. Therefore, *Body* being evidently *Divisible*; *Spirit*, which differs from it, must be necessarily *Indivisible*: For, since *Body* and *Spirit* Differ; and they are formally made to differ by their Differences, by Prop. 2. and those Differences are *most Opposite*, or do *most differ*, by Prop. 4. and every thing is what it is Constituted, or made to be; this Proposition is as Self-evident, as, that [*A Thing is what it is*;] or, that [*What is Divisible, is Divisible*; and, *What is Indivisible, is Indivisible.*] Which are, all of them, Identicals.

Prop. 6. Therefore, whatever is Affirm'd of *Body*, except the Generical, or Common Notion of Thing, must be Deny'd of *Spirit*: For, since all Predicates (except that of the Common Notion) must be taken from  
the

the Difference ; and the Difference is that which makes *one* of the Species different, or distinct, from all others ; that is, *constitutes*, or makes it to be *no other* ; and, consequently, (since it must be something,) makes it to be *it self* only ; it follows, that Body and Spirit are *so*, or, *in such a manner*, Distinct, as those Differences make them, by Prop. 3. that is, are *most Different*, or *most Oppos'd* ; that is, *Contradictorily Distinct* ; or, are of *Contradictory Natures* to one another, by Prop. 4. & 5. Wherefore, that whatever (besides the Common Notion of Thing) is *Affirm'd* of the One, must be *Deny'd* of the Other, is as Self-evident, as, that [Contradiction (or, saying contradictorily, by *is*, and *is not*,) is Contradiction.] Which is *Identical*.

Prop. 7. Wherefore, since we do truly and properly *Affirm* of BODY, that it is *Successive*, or *Part after Part*, in its Operations ; the *Contradictory*, viz. that 'tis *Unsuccessive*, *Simultaneous*, or *Instantaneous*, in its Operations, must, by Prop. 6. be *Affirm'd* of SPIRIT. Therefore, this Proposition is as Self-evident, as it is, that [What is not part after part, is not part after part ; but all at once.] Which is evidently *Identical*.

Prop. 8. Whatever is *Mutable*, is *otherwise afterwards*, than it was *before* ; and, consequently, 'tis *Successive* : For, if it has

all it had before, (neither *more*, nor *less*,) 'tis manifestly the *Same*, or *Unchang'd*; and, where there is no *Successiveness*, there can be no possible Ground for *Before*, or *After*: Wherefore, this is as Self-evident, as it is, that [*What must remain the same, or can receive no Change, is Unchangeable.*] Which is *Identical*.

*Prop. 9.* Wherefore, an *Angel* (being, by *Prop. 6.* & *7.* *Unsuccessive*) is naturally *Unchangeable*.

50. Ere I come to examine Mr. *Le Grand's* Solution of this Demonstration, I desire all Ingenuous Readers to reflect what Advantage it would bring to True Knowledge, or SCIENCE, were this *Connected* Way of Discourfing from Clear Grounds brought into Fashion, and candidly pursu'd. It would quickly make Truth appear; and discover, what Productions are the *Genuine* Effects of *Right Reason*, and what is only *Loose Talk*. It would put an *End* to all *Controversies*, and avoid all Occasions of Men's Catching at, and availing themselves, by those insignificant Methods of Wrangling, Ill Language, and Prevarication; to which Obstinate Opposers of Truth are forc'd to have recourse. Whence, I must sincerely declare that (as far as I am conscious to my self of my own Intentions) it was not  
any



any Arrogancy, or Vanity of preferring my Labours, and Thoughtful Productions, before those of some Writers, who took not this Way of Connexion but seem'd wholly to disregard it: but, that which caus'd me to take that Way of expressing my self with that *Assuredness*, was, an Earnest Desire to *invite*, and (as far as I could possibly) *incite* others, and breed an Emulation in them to follow such a Method, as might set Truth in a *Clear Light*, advance Science, and discountenance and beat down Scepticism, and all its Inconclusive Ways of *Talking*; which, in Philosophy, where Solid and *Well-grounded Truth* is aim'd at, (let it be never so *Pretty*, and *Witty*,) amounts to no more, nor deserves any better Name, but that of *Idle Tittle-Tattle*. Nay, I express'd my self, in my Preface to *Solid Philosophy Asserted*, that I was aware this would be objected to me; and, therefore, I did there (from §. 8. to §. 14.) alledge many Reasons, to shew that this Carriage was necessary for a Writer who resolv'd, without Fear or Favour of any, to pursue those *Good Ends*; and to put it to the Test, what *Doctrins*, or *Method*, was *True*; what *Sophisticate*, and *False*. Which Reasons, till they answer, themselves must confess, that their Objecting Arrogancy can only be built on their seeing my Heart, and penetrating

my Inward and Invisible Intentions. The plain Truth is, Mr. *Le Grand* would have had me speak well of his Books, (and other Writers of the same Strain and Pitch;) for which Reason he complains of me sadly, in his Preface to his former Treatise, that I had not so much as read his Books, *sive Latine, sive Gallicè scriptos*; (there is a *Quod nota bene* for you, now!) My Reasons why I neglected that *Expected Duty* were these: First, Because (except his Volume which is a Collection out of *Descartes* his *Placita*) they were so very Famous, and universally taken notice of, that I never so much as heard of them. Next, I did not apprehend I had any such great Obligation to read them. Thirdly, I read as much of them as I had occasion to speak to; which did not so hugely please me, as to think it worth my while to look after any more of them. Lastly, Those I had read were like Whipp'd Cream; being so empty of *Solid Sense* and *Frothy*, so void of *Principles* or *Connexion*, that is, without either *Head* or *Tail*, that I was weary of them. And, as for his last Books, he has so doubly disfigur'd them with Ill Language, that the Ground-work of them is Insipid and Unconnected Talk; and the Embroidery of them is Raillery: Which are no such great Philters, to make me in love with their Brethren; nor could  
any

any Flattery be so fulsom from me, as to deck them with *Encomiums*. But, Words from an Adversary are of *no Weight*; Let us, then, come to examine how *pertinently* and *punctually* he has Answer'd this Demonstration, which was so highly incumbent upon him. I earnestly beg of the Reader, to take the pains to go along with me for this once, so that we may get a full View of the Solution of it; which, if he does, I am confident he will confess, that never did a weaker Writer appear in Print; and, that he will both grant that my farther Confuting him is *Needless*; and, withall, will admire I have had the Patience to lose my Time so long upon such an Insignificant Trifler.

§ 1. He recites my Demonstration in his *Censura*, p. 44. and sets himself to answer it, p. 45. First, He says, *This Demonstration is none of those he brought formerly; but, that this is the first time he has produc'd it.* What is this to purpose? Let it be where it will, whose it will, or whensoever first produc'd, here it is; and I have challeng'd him, and his *Cartesians*, to Answer it; and therefore, we are to expect their Performance. Yet, he is much out, even when he talks *frivolously*; for, I produc'd it formerly, at large, (tho' not in the self-same manner,) in my *Method to Science*, p. 316. as any one that can read, may see. Next,

He says, I durst not repeat here my former Argument, drawn from the Immutability of GOD. He says very right; for, I dare not commit such a Folly, as to repeat an Argument which was brought to evince Another Point, to prove This Thesis, which is so widely Different from it. The Immutability of GOD was my Medium, to prove, that GOD could not be the Immediate Cause of that which is Essentially Mutable, as Motion is; his Nature being Contradictory to it. Why must this Argument be repeated here, where we are speaking of the Manner of Operating peculiar to Angels? Tho' this be nothing to purpose, and fillily Ridiculous; yet, the Words, [*He durst not bring it here,*] look Great; and would persuade his Readers, if they were Fools, that he has frightened me from my Argument; which, tho' he sets a good Face on it, and looks and talks Big, I dare say, poor Man! himself is far from hoping. Thirdly, He talks Ironically of its Formidable and Invincible Strength. Whether it be Invincible, will be best seen by his Answer to it: But, it seems, 'tis Formidable to him; for he is loath to come up to it, but makes his Approaches very backwardly, and cautiously. Fourthly, He calls it Garrulity, and (afterwards) Verboſity. What Reader will not smile at his Humour of saying any thing, tho' never so manifestly

*manifestly False?* Whoever reviews my Argument, put down by himself, in the fore-going Page, and in my very Words, will see there is not *one* superfluous Word in it, but barely as many as suffic'd to shew the *Connexion* of my Discourse: And, of all the things in the World, *Verbesity* and *Garrulity* in a Demonstration is the only way to *blunt* and *spoil* the Force of the Argument; since this *Loosness* of much Talk, blinds the Considerer from seeing the *Close Coherence* of its Terms. But this acquaints us perfectly with his *Genius*: The very Grain of his Thoughts is laid; so cross to all kind of *Connexion*, that he thinks all *Connected Discourse* is nothing but *Idle Babbling*; and, that only *Loose* and *Rambling* Talk is *True Demonstration*.

52. But, these *Avant-Guards* of his, are only *Whiffers* before the *Show*, to make way: Now comes the *Answer* it self. First, He excepts against the Common Notion of *Ens*, or *Thing*; which I had said, consisted in this, that *It had a Power, to be, or could be*. Upon which, he thus descants; *Quasi verò Essentia omnis Entis, Finiti, tam Creati quàm Creandi, non sit, quid Positivum, sed nihil aliud quàm Potentia Essendi, seu id quod Quo possit Esse*. More Folly, and Shifting Tricks, could not have been well crouded into five Lines! Where did I speak in the *Abstract* of *Essentia*,

*sentia*, *Potentia* *essendi*, or *Quo potest esse*? Does not he see, in my Words, put down lately by himself, that I speak of *Ens*, or the *Concrete*; and, that, in my *Id. Cartes. p. 244.* where I demonstrate to him, what the Notion of *Ens Creatum* must be, (of which he takes no notice here, but only talks against, that is, denies, my Conclusion,) I express'd what was meant by such an *Ens*, *p. 245. l. 2, 3, viz. Illud quod potest existere*; and, all along, I name *Ens*, *Corpus*, *Spiritus*, which are all *Concretes*. And, surely, he will not say that the Essence of Created Things includes *Actual Existence*; for, if he does, he makes them so many GODS; for, 'tis the Prerogative of the *Deity* only, *Essentially to Exist*. Let him take any Individual, Created Things, (those being most properly Things;) For Example; *Michael*, *Peter*, a Horse, a Stone, &c. and then examine his Thoughts, whether he finds either *Actual Being*, or *Not-being*, in their Notions; and, if he cannot, but finds (as he must) they Abstract from both, that all that can be said of *Ens*, as to what it has of *it self*, or its own Nature and Essence, in order to *Being*, is, that it *can be*, or *can receive Existence*, if the First Cause pleases to give it. This being so, let us abstract the Notion of *Ens* from all Individuals; and we shall see that the Notion of *Ens*, or *Thing*, in  
Common,

Common, is *That* which is Capable of Being, and can be no other.

33. Having thus *chang'd* my Words, let us see what Advantage he makes of this slippery Dealing. He objects, that this would make the Notion of *Ens* not to be *Positive*. What means he? Does he think that the Notion of *Quo est Res*, or the Form, or *quo potest esse Res*, (suppose I had said so,) is not *Positive*; whereas, 'tis Impossible a *Negative Nature* can exist, or render a Thing Capable of Existing? Indeed, Aristotle's First Matter is defin'd *Negative-ly*, as having no kind of Form at all in its Notion, neither *Substantial*, nor *Accidental*; but, that the Form which is part of the Essence, and constitutes the Thing, should be *Negative* too, would make the whole Thing to be made up of *Negatives*; which is such a strange Blunder in *Philosophy*, as admits no Parallel. The Form determines the Potentiality, or Indifference of the Matter, and makes it become *Thn*, or an Individual Thing, and so fits it for *Existence*; because a Thing in *Common*, or that which is *Indeterminate*, is not Capable of Existing. Now, that the Essence that makes an *Individual Thing*, which is the *most Positive* Notion we have, (or rather, no Notion is *perfectly Positive*, but it,) should not be *Positive it self*, or be *less Positive*, because it makes the Matter

capable



capable of a farther, and best Perfection, to wit, the last Actuality of *Existence*, is a Paradox unheard of in Metaphysics. So that Mr. *Le Grand* has alter'd my Words, and yet gets no Advantage by it, but blunders himself, while he went to blunder the Demonstration. For, What is all this to the Argument? If he do but grant that *Body* and *Spirit* are Species of *Thing in Common*, or (which is the same) that they are both of them *Things*, (which 'tis a Madness to deny,) the Demonstration, which consists in the Connexion or Agreement of the Notions, will go on, and proceed, whether he will or no. And, this he fore-sees very well; and therefore, by throwing these *Flim-flams*, as *Rubs* in the way, he endeavours to keep it off, and hinder it from going on.

54. Next, He tells us, that *De Corpore & Spiritu, rebus finitis actu existentibus, nunc sermo instituitur*: This Discourse treats of *Body* and *Spirit*, actually existent. I beseech him, who stated the Question on this fashion, or pretended we spoke of *This Body*, or *This Spirit*, which only do actually exist: He knows, that, when he put my Demonstration, I acknowledg'd, that I spoke of *Body* and *Spirit*, which were the Species of *Ens*, in Common; and therefore, are themselves the most common Notions next to it; and, not *Particulars*, which

which only do exist actually. Yet, he tells us, *Nunc Sermo instituitur* : The Speech now, is, of Things actually existing. I beseech him, *Whose Speech ? His, or Mine ? Not Mine,* as is now shewn : It must mean, then, that 'tis *His* Speech. And, by what Rule must I needs *speak* as he would have me ? Certainly, I have Right to put my own Demonstration as I please *my self*. It lies before him ; and, he is to answer it as it lies. What wriggling is here to pervert the Sense of it, instead of representing it in my own *Words*, and *Solving* it ! Again, this is a Sign he knows little what belongs to *Science* ; for this treats of the *Abstracted* Notions and Natures of the *Subjects* we handle ; which, *as distinctly such*, exist in our *Understanding*, and *no where else* ; for, there they are *concise*, and *exact*, even to an *Indivisible* ; whereas, if we treat of them as they *actually exist* in Matter, or *in re*, they are jumbld confusedly with innumerable *other* Modes ; so that there cannot possibly be any *Science*, nor Demonstration of them at all. I wish him to reflect upon all the particular Sciences in the Mathematicks, whether they are of Circles, Squares, Triangles, &c. and he will see they do all of them treat of those *Formal* Notions, or Natures, *abstractedly*, from their Actual Existence *in re* ; where, perhaps, no Figures, Mathematically so exact as our  
Mind

Mind frames of them, are to be found. The same is to be said, when we treat of the *Common* Notions of *Ens*, *Corpus*, *Spiritus*, &c. which can no where exist, but in the Understanding: Nay, 'tis evident, I speak of *Ens* Formally, as its Notion is taken Generically, or of *Ens* in *Common*; and, sure, he will not say, the *Thing* formally, as in *Common*, can any where actually exist, but in our Mind.

56. He proceeds after his old rate, and tells his Reader, that all my *Verbosity*, *hec solum vult*, means only this, that *Body* has *Parts*, and *Spirit* has none; and, that therefore, *Body* is *Successive*, and thence *Mutable*; and *Spirit* *Immutable*. He puts my Reason, after a fashion, indeed; yet, only slightly, and stubberingly: He would have more oblig'd me to have us'd my own *Words*, which were more *Ample*, and *Full*, viz. That the Differences which constitute them being *Contradictory*, it follows, that whatever we say of the *One*, (except what belongs to the *Common* Notion of *Thing*,) the *Contradictory* to it must be said of the *Other*; and, therefore, if *Body* have *Succession* in its Operations, *Spirit* must have none, but must have all its Operations in an *Instant*; and, consequently, be *Immutable*. However, I thank him he has put the *Substance* of my Demonstration on any fashion, tho' not forcibly, but rawly. Here 'tis

'tis the Argument *presses*; now let us expect his *Solution*. First, He says the Answer is *Easie*; and, 'tis true; for, in *his* Way one may easily, without any Trouble, Answer all *Euclid*: 'tis but altering his Words, and *saying* something, or railing some extravagant Scruple against his *Conclusions*, and the Deed is done. Next, He grants they may know *some* Things at *one View*, but *not all*. This is *said*; but, still the Question is, Why not *All at once*, if *Some*? His Reason? Does the Knowledge of those *Some* burthen or *fill* the Angel's Intellect, so, that it can *hold no more*? No, surely; for, we experience, even in our Souls here, that are very much Inferiour to the Intelligences, which are *Pure Acts*, that the having *some* Knowledge, *increases* our Capacity to take in *more*; whence 'tis demonstrable, that nothing can *fill* or *satisfie* them, but the Sight of an *Infinite Truth*, or the Beatifical Vision of *GOD*. Do Angels require some Time to have *more* Knowledge, because slowly-moving Corporeal Phantasms, must *bring* things leisurely into their Understanding; or, Impressions on their Nerves *occasion* the producing *Ideas*? Neither of these can be said. What hinders, then, their having at once *all* they naturally can have? Are not all Truths, the Objects of these Knowledges, *Connected*; but some of them stand

stand at variance with one another? This would disgrace GOD's Workmanship, the Product of his Wisdom, if we make Truths *Incoherent, Contradictory* and *Chimerical*. None of these Rubs, then, being possible, which only could hinder or retard an Angel from having *all* his Intellectual Operations in an Instant, it had been but a piece of Civility in Mr. *Le Grand* to have bestow'd upon us *some Reason* for his dissenting from us in this Point; and, not to have pop't us off with a *bare* voluntary *Denial* of the Conclusion, which is the only thing in question.

57. For, we have much more Right to expect his Reason, because (as was now said) this Denial of his, instead of *Answering* the *Argument*, is a plain Denying the *Immediate Conclusion* which follow'd from that Demonstration. Yet, I must say, that (however those foolish Fellows, the Logicians, would laugh at him, for such an Unpardonable Errour in Disputation, yet) he behaves himself here like a Civil Gentleman; for, he compounds with us, and grants very kindly, that they do *at once* know *some Things*, but denies they have all the Operations belonging to them *at once*, or know *all* they ought to know in an Instant. Now, this being evidently the Conclusion of my Argument, (as far as I there press'd it,) 'tis a double Injury; first,

first, only to hint the Argument, and then slide away from speaking to it, and *deny* our *Conclusion*; and, yet, give us no kind of Reason why. Yet, he pretends to give us something that he would have *thought* a Reason, tho' 'tis so *slight*, that he is shy to call it so: Which we will hearken to; only, let it be first remember'd, that he is *Arguing* against the *Conclusion*, which he had most learnedly *Deny'd*; and, not *Answering* my *Argument*, or shewing that the Terms of it do not *cohere*; or, that the Conclusion does not *follow* out of my *Premisses*. His Reason (if it be one) is grounded on an Explication of his own Doctrine, that GOD moves Matter *Immediately*; which, unless he first establishes, (as he never *did*, nor *can*,) his Foundation shakes. However, that *suppos'd*, he demonstrates it after his usual sort, by bringing a *Parallel*. His Discourse runs thus: Bodies are Stupid Things; nor could they stir at all, if GOD did not *give* and *conserve* their Motion, and all the Modes of it: And, in like manner, GOD gives and conserves *Cogitation*, and the Modes of Cogitation, to *Angels*. Wherefore, as a Body does not therefore *lose its Essence* by Moving *more* or *less*, so an Angel does not *lose his Essence* by *Thinking more* or *less*. Where are we now? I am sure we are rambl'd quite out of the Purlue of  
our

our Question. My Conclusion only *says*, and my Argument only aims to *prove*, that if the Ordinary Laws of an Angel's Operating be observ'd, it would know all it is naturally to know *at once*, and not *successively*; but, that it would, otherwise, *lose its Essence*, I never said, nor thought; nor that GOD, acting Supernaturally, cannot devest them of some Property they have, tho' *naturally ally'd* to its *Essence*. So that, he first *Denies* my *Conclusion*, instead of *Answering* my *Argument*: Next, brings a *Parallel* for an *Argument*; and when he has brought it, he shoots it at *Rovers*, and levels it at a wrong Mark: So far he is from knowing what belongs to any one Rule belonging to *Disputation*. Add, that his pretended *Parallel* is the most *Unparallel* of any he could have invented; *Divisible* and *Indivisible* are the *Essential*, or *Intrinsic* Differences of *Ens*; nor can there be any *Ens*, but it must be either the *One*, or the *Other* of them. Are *Moving more*, or *Moving less*, *Essential* Differences of *Body*? Or, cannot *Body* be, without being *either of them*? Could not GOD's Omnipotence have kept their First Matter from *Moving*, when he had first *Created* it? Or, are [*Moving more*, and *Moving less*,] *Contradictories*; as are the Differences I put, and argue from them? Or, could an Angel, which is a *Pure Act*, have been



been Created without *Knowing* at all, as a *Body* could without *Moving* at all? What a *Lame* Similitude then, or *Parallel*, is this, which has *never a Leg* to run on! And, yet, he will needs make it *run* on a *Sleeveless Errand*, and applies it to a *Point* which is *Foreign* to our *Question*. Add, farther, that our *Question* is not *here* of an *Angel's Simultaneous Knowledge omnium rerum, of all things*, as he puts it: 'Tis not the *Quantity* or *Extension* of the *Angelical Knowledges*, which I do *here* strive to *e-vince*; but the *Unsuccessfulness* of them; or, that it has them *all at once*, (*whether they are many or fewer, large or narrow*;) from whence is deduc'd immediately, that 'tis *naturally Immutabile*.

58. Yet, of this Aukward Answer he is so fond, that he *Crows* over my *Demonstration* most *Triumphantly*, in these Words, p. 45. [*Quâ simplice solutione, &c. By which Simple Solution, all the Herculean Strength of his Demonstration, as Sampson's did of old, by meerly cutting off his Hairs, falls to the Ground, to his great Disgrace.*] And, I must confess, 'tis (as he says) a *Simple Solution* indeed. Were he but half as *Powerful* in his *Arguments* and *Solutions*, as he is in his *Confident Braggadochio Talk*, he would be *Invincible*. Poor Man! He thinks the *Tinkling* a few *sine* Latin Phrases is far beyond all the strongest Reasons in the World:

World: And, can any Man think I have nothing else to do, but to stand laying open the *Nonsense* of such a perpetual *Trifler*?

59. This may serve for a Sample of his *Solutions* of my Arguments, by which (since this concerns him *more than all the others*) we may judge of *all the rest*: For, I am forc'd to take the Method of proceeding by *Instances*, in regard it would require a Volume to lay open *all* his Follies of each kind. In the next place, I will produce an Instance or two, of his Great Talent of *Aggravating* and *Perverting* my Words to a *Sinister* and *Invidious* Sense; which is an *Essential Part* of this *New Cartesian Method*, and takes up near a quarter of his Book; and, withall, gives it a Thousand times a *greater Shew* of being *Victorious*, than all his *Arguments*. An Honourable and Worthy Gentleman hapt to say, that the *Parts* of the *Cartesian Doctrine* did *sum quodam lepore sibi consentire*, agree to one another with a certain *Grace*, or *Prettiness*; than which, I know no Expression more proper. I reply'd to Mr. *Le Grand*, who seem'd fond of this Commendation, in my *Id. Cart. p. 10.* and granted, it was *not only* *Lepida*, *Graceful*, or *Pretty*; but also, *Witty*. Which says the same that Noble Person said; and I added a farther Commendation to it.<sup>3</sup> Upon this,  
Mr.

Mr. Le Grand tells his Reader, that, *Nobilissimum illum Virum spiculis suis venenatis petit*; that I assault, or set upon that Noble Person with my Poyson'd Darts. His Fancy is, certainly, very fearfully *Hypochondriack*: Every thing is a *Spiculum*, or *Dart*, that he dislikes. Thus a silly *Asterisk*, casually left in the Context, in my *METHOD*, was interpreted as a Design, *transfigere ipsum quinque radiis tanquam tot Spiculis*; to strike him thorow with those Five Points, as with so many Darts. Nay, he tells me, moreover, in that Preface, §. 31. that I have *petulans ingenium ac Judicium pravam*, for attempting to do him that Mischief with those five Darts of that *Asterisk*; and is so afraid of being *transfix'd*, or run thorow by them, that he complains of it sadly to the Reader (it being, as we are to conceive, a Matter of much Weight) a second time there, in §. 44. Of which, see *Id. Cartes. p. 30. & 72.* Another Instance of his Ranting, and shameful *Exaggeration*, shall be this: He had quoted *Bellarmin*, to say, that a piece of *Wood* was turn'd into *Stone*. I reply'd, That it did not appear, but *Stony Particles* might be interwoven with the *Wooden ones*, *Id. Cartes. p. 45.* for which I gave my Reason. What Harm, what Incivility is in this Reply? None. Yet, let Mr. Le Grand come to represent it, (who, as Icteric

Men

Men see all things Yellow, *dyes* every Word, tho' never so Innocent, into the Colour of his own *furious Choler*, and renders it *Hideous*,) it amounts to this, in his Language, (*Cens. pag. 112.*) Bellarmine *Rationis expers es, mentiris* : Bellarmin, *thou hast no Sense (or Reason) in thee ; Thou Lye'st.* Hundreds of such Ingenuous Representations of my Words garnish his *Censure* ; to which, what Credit is to be given, these few Instances may inform us : And the Reader may observe, that whenever he is most *Transported* and *Furious* in *Amplifying*, he may be sure there is always the *least Reason*. And, so much for this *Exaggerating Method*, so *Useful* and *Proper* to our New *Cartesians*.

60. Another Method of theirs, is, to *impose* upon me *False Tenets*, to make me look like a *Monster* of *Folly* and *Impiety*. These are great *Sticklers* in his, and his Friend *Merry-man's Pamphlets* ; and give the *briskest Vigour* to their *Invectives*. For example ; He tells the Reader, (*p. 42.*) that I say, *It is infinitely more Impossible that GOD should change an Angel, (if it were Changeable at all,) after the First Instant, than that it self, or another Angel, should do it.* Now, What Man, reading these Words, thus industriously singl'd out, would not verily think I made GOD *infinitely less Powerful than an Angel*, or any other

other Creature ; and admire at my Folly, and Impiety, both ? But, read the *whole Discourse* there, and it is evidently quite contrary ; nor could any Man more highly magnifie GOD's Attributes, than I do in *that very place*. My Discourse is this : An Indivisible Effect must be put in an Instant ; therefore, it *will* be put in the *first* Instant, if *all* that is requisite to produce that Effect be put : Those Requisites are, *Power* in the Cause, and *Disposition* to exercise that Power, and *Application* of the Agent to the Patient ; and, that, in case the Agent be not yet Dispos'd to act, it must be *Chang'd*, so to be *made Dispos'd*. Wherefore, since 'tis *Infinitely* more Impossible GOD should not have *Power* to do it in the *First* Instant, being *All-powerful*, than that another Spirit should not have such a Power ; or, not be *Dispos'd* of himself to act, he being *Pure* and *Infinite Actuality* ; or, that he can be *Chang'd*, thus to be *made Dispos'd*, he being *Unchangeable* ; or, not be *Apply'd*, he being *Omnipresent* ; than it is, that an *Angel* should not have Power to do this Effect ; or, be *chang'd*, so to be *fitted* to act : Or, not be *Apply'd* most intimately to the Patient ; therefore, 'tis infinitely more Impossible GOD should not do it in the *First* Instant, (that is, *not after the First* Instant,) if the Effect were feasible, than that an

*Angel*, which falls *infinitely short* in every regard, should not do it *in the First Instant*; or, (which is the same,) should do it *after the First Instant*. See my Demonstration, in my *METHOD*; from *p. 307.* to *p. 314.* particularly, *p. 313.* Now, 'tis evident, that, in this Discourse, I bear up to GOD's Attributes, there mentioned; and maintain them to be *infinitely above* those of the *best Created Beings*, in every regard. What do these Men? They pick out a few Words, and *purposely conceal* the whole *Tenour* of my Discourse; and, by this False Dealing, endeavour to impose upon me so *Wicked an Impiety*, as neither any *Christian*, nor any *Hearthen*, who holds a First Being, did ever assert. How he deforms this Argument, by singling out a few other Words, may be seen in his *Censure*, *p. 49.* Judge then, Reader, whether those poor spiteful Men have not renounc'd all Shame and Conscience, who dare thus wilfully defame their Neighbour, and fraudulently abuse their Reader. Would not a Lawyer that us'd such a Dishonest Trick, in Altering the Words which concern'd the Title of an Estate, be *turn'd over the Bar*, and *hated* by all Honest Men? Something worse than this as containing the same Malice, and in far worse Circumstances, is this *Other Instance*. He had, in the Preface of his former

former Book, §. 40. made me to say, it was *Vile opus & Laboriosum*, for GOD to be the Immediate Cause of Motion. He put it directly upon me, as my very Words; by introducing it with *Pergit, statimque addit*; and, by printing the Word [*Laboriosum*] in Italick Letter, and the same with the other Words, which were truly mine. This makes me Impious against GOD, with a Witness; for, it represents my Opinion to be, That GOD makes use of the Ministry of Angels, to ease himself (forsooth!) of the *Fatigue and Weariness*, which, otherwise, he would have felt, had he mov'd the First Matter Himself. Hereupon, I challeng'd him to have flatly falsify'd my Words, and, to have added [*Laboriosum*,] to put upon me such an absurd Doctrine, as never came into the Head of any Man acquainted with Christianity, or Common Sense. I had happ'd to express it to be a *Drudgery mis-becoming GOD's Essence, who is Unchangeable, to be the Immediate Cause of Motion, or Change*. Where, 'tis manifest, I put it upon the *Mis-becomingness, or Unsutableness* to GOD's Nature, which is *Pure Actuality of Existence*, to cause Change immediately; because, *Being* only was the Proper Effect of Him, whose Nature was *Self-Existence*. Yet, in despite of all the Concomitant Words, and the whole Te-



nour of the Discourse, instead of *Retra-  
cting*, or *Excusing* his Fault, he stands to it  
stoutly, p.44. And, why? Because *Drudges*  
do use to *toyl* and *meyl*, and *sweat* and *la-  
bour*, and *lead* (as we say) a *weary Life*.  
As if there were not *Meanness*, in *Drudge-  
ry*, and *Indignity* for the Master of the Fa-  
mily to perform, it being below his Fun-  
ction; and, as if the Concomitant Word,  
[*Mis-becoming*,] and [*Vile*.] join'd with it,  
did not restrain it manifestly to this Sense,  
that it was *Indignum DEO*; and, not such  
a *Toilsem* Business to *move Matter*, which  
every Angel can do. Could it be possibly  
thought by any Man in his Wits, that he  
who holds that GOD Created Heaven  
and Earth, of Nothing, in an *Instant*,  
should think he had not Power to give  
*Motion* to Bodies, without *over-straining*  
himself? Who, but a Mad man, could  
hold two such Inconsistent Tenets? Or,  
What Man, well in his Wits, could hope  
to obtain Belief that I held such a piece of  
Extravagant Nonsense? But, what can-  
not Impotent Passion *feign*, and *pretend*,  
when Reason is *Nonpluss'd*? Something was  
to be said when he was at a Plunge; and  
any thing is taken up, in that Exigence,  
to serve a turn; and, the more *Extrava-  
gant* it is, the better it pleases his *Humour*;  
which never lets him consider whether it  
be *Credible*, or no: It serves to bespatter,  
and

and vent his Uneasie Anger, which is still boiling in his Breast; and, that is enough for his purpose.

61. Another piece of this *New Cartesian Method*, is, To cry aloud against me, and call me *Proud, Self-conceited, and Arrogant*, if I will not allow such Writers as himself to be most Excellent Philosophers: Or, if I hap to dissent from other Learned Men, in *some* Opinions, (as, Who does not?) then, presently, he complains pathetically, that I *damm, contemn, and trample upon* those Authors: Or, if I do but say, I *demonstrate* such a Point; or, that others do not demonstrate; then, presently, I am *as Proud as Lucifer*; and, the Lord knows what. How sincere he is in alledging this, will appear by the examining three most signal Places he makes Choice of; where he objects it, (§. 40.) In which he makes me say, [*Providentiam Divinam, ex Aliis omnibus, me, ad Rationem Dominio suo restituendam selegisse:*] that Divine Providence had chosen out Me, from All Others, to restore Reason to her Dominion, or Sovereignty, over Fancy. This, certainly, thus worded, sounds proudly. But, may we not fear, after so many Trials, that Mr. Le Grand has falsify'd my Words, tho' he puts them all for mine: and, that too, in a Distinct Character? To say, I would attempt or endeavour this, is but to ex-

press, that my Zeal for Truth had put me upon such a *bold* Undertaking, and, withall, to give an Encouragement to the Reader to weigh my Argument: Or, to say, that I apprehended GOD's Providence had *enabl'd* me to perform this, was no more than to say, I had writ a *Method to Science*, which the Title-Page had profess'd openly; for which too, I gave GOD the Glory. But, to say GOD had *chosen me, out of All others*, can become no body but a Proud and Imprudent Boaster. How proves he this? that is, How shews he these Words, thus put together, in my Books? Why, he cites the very places; which, if *True*, must *shame* me; if *False*, must *disgrace* him, as a Falsifyer. The First of the Places he cites, is found in the Preface to my *METHOD*, p. 27. where I find, in the Beginning of that §, these Words; *I have not enumerated these Particulars, to boast my Performances; but, to bespeak my Reader's Pardon, if, travelling in an Unbeaten Road, I happen now and then to stumble.* Which have not the least Shew of *Arrogancy*, but the quite *Contrary*. Indeed, I say, p. 27. that *It is Impossible for any Wit of Man to invent any other Way than what I have propos'd; that is, Solid and Evident*: Which, I say there, is, *to build on the Nature of the Thing, and frame my Discourses by Connexion of Terms.* But, do  
I pre-

I pretend, that what I propos'd was my own *Invention*, or that I am the *Author* of it; as the *Wondrously Modest Cartesius* did; who oppos'd all the present and past World, to set up his *New-fangl'd Doctrin*? Do not all *Aristotelians* pretend to it, as well as I? And, Did not all the Learned World follow it, till *Cartesius's* Time? With what Ingenuity, then, does he tell his Reader, in the Margin, that this is *Arrogantia* J. S. *non aliàs audita*; the *Unheard of Arrogance* of J. S. to propose in his Books, (in Opposition to the *Ideists*,) what Ten Thousand had propos'd before him? The Second Place he cites, is, from the Epistle Dedicatory to *Solid Philosophy Asserted*, §. 8. where I have these Words, [I must own, I have a high Opinion of my Principles, and of my Method, which Nature, and GOD's Good Providence, have laid, and establish'd.] Is it *Arrogance* to have a high Opinion of what GOD, and Nature (the Work of his Divine Wisdom) have done? For, it is plain, that I do not pretend I have any hand in establishing either of them. My *Non Ultra* has told them why I have a high Opinion of my Principles, because they are built on the Metaphysical Verity of Things, establish'd by the Ideas in the Divine Understanding: And of my Method, or Way of Discourse; because Nature, or (which is the same) GOD, as Author of

Nature, has made our Soul such an Inferiour sort of Spirit, that it works by *Abstract* or *Inadequate* Notions, which we *compound* or *connect* into Propositions, (in which all Truth formally consists;) and then *connect* those Propositions into Coherent Discourses. These, then, being by me ascrib'd to GOD and Nature, I assume nothing to my self, but my *Conclusions*; and, of these I deliver'd my self thus, in the Words immediately following: [*But, as for my Conclusions, and my Deductions, as I will not justify them with the same Firmness as I did the others, so I should not think I ought to propose them to Learned Men, unless I judg'd them Demonstrative.*] And, now, where is all this *Unheard of Arrogancy*? Where is my Bragging that GOD had *Selected* me so particularly, *from All Others*, which he most expressly puts upon me; and pretends to shew them, [*tribus ex locis,*] *from three Places*; of which, these are *Two*, where not a Word is found favouring of *Arrogancy*, or any thing like it; but, rather, the direct *Contrary*? Would it be Uncivil, on this Occasion, to ask of Mr. Le Grand, whether he has not *forsworn* all *Sincerity*, and *Common Honesty*? To *slander* is too great a *Crime* for a good *Christian* to be *Guilty* of; but, to *falsifie* his *Adversary's Words*, and *Slander* him too; or rather, to *pretend* falsely he says *thus*, or *thus*,  
in

in such Determinate Places, (which Particularizing makes it look Credible,) on purpose *that he may slander him*, is so voluntary and wilful a Complicated Crime, that the Tenderest, and most Indulgent Charity is at a loss to invent an Excuse for it.

62. The Third Place to which he refers his Reader, is taken out of the Dedicatory to *Solid Philosophy Asserted*; where there are, indeed, some of those Words, but not one of those *haughty* ones he here expressly and distinctly fixes upon me. My Discourse in the two fore-going Pages, was, concerning the *Way of Ideas* made use of by *Cartesius*, and others; which, I made account, did delude their good *Reason*; and, by making them disregard the *Nature of the Thing*, led them into *Fancies*, and *Imaginary Conceits*: I gave there for the Reason why I writ Philosophy, That I apprehended *GOD's Providence* had fitted and enabl'd me to redress such great *Mischiefs*, (*viz.* that *Fancies* should beat down Reason and Truth;) and therefore, I thought it became me to Re-instate Reason in her Sovereignty over Fancy; and, to assert to her the Rightful Dominion Nature had given her, over all our Judgments. ] Which amounts to this, That I thought my self able to confute his *Way of Ideas*, and to shew it to be Opposite to True Reason.

Is it such a piece of Arrogancy to pretend to be able to confute a piece of *Novelty*, so Opposite to the Way of all the former World, (especially, ascribing, as I did, that Ability to GOD?) Or rather, (if there be any Arrogancy at all on either side,) Is it not more like Arrogancy in them, to blame the Methods of so many Thousands of Learned Men, who writ before them; and, by introducing New Ways of Philosophizing, to accuse, by Consequence, all the former World of Ignorance? Is it not rather Arrogance in him, to be so haughtily and rudely Stiff in maintaining Ideas (as he says) Elicited, or produc'd by Himself, without even attempting to bring any one Demonstration, or Conclusive Proof for them? Can there be any Self-Conceit more Enormous, than to be thus Ravingly Earnest to maintain that he has this Invisible Gift of Producing Ideas out of his own Head, or *ex se*, (as he expresses it;) which he holds to be the only Ground of all True Knowledge, without bringing any one Argument that is able to evince it; and, then, because we will not believe him without Proof, to foam thus at the Mouth with the foulest Language the most Transported Rage could dictate? See his Words at the End of this §. [*Quis a Luciferi lapsu, superbius unquam de Seipso senserit! What Man, since the Fall of Lucifer,*  
*had*



*bad ever such a Proud Conceit of himself!]*  
Then follows my never-heard-of *Arrogance*,  
my *Intolerable Arrogance*, my *Nequissima*, most  
*VVicked Arrogance*. Poor *Impotent Railer!*  
Whose *Passion* will neither let him reflect  
how he dishonours his Place, disgraces  
his Friends, scandalizes Good Christians,  
or wrongs his own Conscience. But, in  
the Name of Wonder! How comes it that  
no body but himself ever thought me thus  
damnable *Arrogant!* I do confess, I write  
briskly, and smartly, when I think it Evi-  
dent I write for Truth. It is my Duty:  
And, I have given my Reasons for it in  
my Preface to *Solid Philosophy*; which he,  
instead of Answering, tells us here only,  
*he cannot read them without Horror*: No,  
nor my *Arguments* neither; for, he an-  
swers them both just alike. In what, then,  
consists this *Arrogancy* of mine? The plain  
Truth is this: and, his Carriage confesses  
it: I had challeng'd him to bring one Prin-  
ciple, or one *Conclusive Proof*, for his New  
*Way* of Philosophy: He has none; and,  
therefore, I must be *Intolerably Arrogant*,  
because he is *Obstinate in his Errours*, and  
*pitifully Ignorant*; as also, because I follow  
the *Way*, which builds Truth on the Nature  
of Things, and on the Connexion of Terms;  
which all the Learned Men in the *World*  
had so long embrac'd, and *Unperverted Na-*  
*ture* teaches every Man.

63. But, we have lost our Third Citation. I beseech my Reader to re-view it, and then to consider whether there be one Word there, that *GOD had Selected me from All Others*; which he here, §. 40. puts upon me, as my Express Words; and prints in a distinct Character, as *mine*. That I have truly represented the Three Places he relates to, will appear by the *Preface* to his former Book, §. 26. where he puts them down at large. This, then, being evident to Eye-sight, I charge him with Three Wilful Falsifications *here*, in citing *Three Places* in my Books for these haughty Words; *viz.* that I said, *I was selected from All Others, &c.* whereas, I only said, that *I apprehended my self Able* to confute his *Ideas*. I demand of him, either to shew me the Words in my Books, or, to acknowledge his Errour. But, I do not expect from him the Candour to retract any of his Slanders, whatsoever he professes *here*, *pag. 2.* For, this would oblige him to make Satisfaction; against which, as I have sufficiently experienc'd, he is (I know not by what Case of Conscience) *Church-Canon-Proof*. This, then, is Another Branch of the *New Cartesian Method of Arguing, and Answering*; *viz.* to falsifie, and impose on his Adversary, whatever Words he pleases: And, he is very Constant, and Diligent, in pursuing that *Useful Method*.

64. An-

64. Another Branch of this *New Method*, is, Without so much as *one Word* to abet his Saying; nay, in despite of *many Words*, and, even, *Avow'd Demonstrations* to the *contrary*; to impose upon me *False, Invidious, Incredible, and Unchristian Tenets*. Thus, *p. 78, 79.* he makes me deny that *the Soul exists when it is separated from the Body*: Nay, he is afraid I deny it is *Created*, but is *ex Traduce*; and, that it is *Extinguish'd with the Body, and Rais'd again at the Last Day*. Nor is this all; but, (that we may see how his *Suspensions* contradict one another,) he calls into Doubt, *p. 78.* whether I *acknowledge a Resurrection*. I see, it is a great Favour he will let me hold *some few* of the *Articles* of my *Creed*; for, he has debarr'd me from holding most of them. His *Reasons*, (such as they are,) as well as I can collect them, or make them look like *Aiming* at any *Sense*, are these. First, I made her *incapable of Pre-existing* before the *Body*, of which she is the *Form*; (of which *Opinion* he seems here an *Earnest Asserter*;) Whence he concludes, I deny she can exist when *Separate* from the *Body afterwards*: And, yet, *p. 78. l. 4.* himself uses my *Words*; which affirm, that, after she is separated, *ex se existere apta est, she is able to exist of her self*. Next; What says he to my *Discourse*: *Ens* is only that which is *capable of Existing*;

*Existing*: But, as the Council of *Vienna* has told him, the Soul is *Forma hominis*; and, therefore, she cannot, of her self, exist *here*; but the *Totum* only, of which, she is a *Part*. Again, I argue thus; That which is *Indeterminate* in any kind, cannot exist; but the Soul, *before* she had Knowledge in the Body, was a meer *Potentia Cognoscendi*, or (as some express it) *Rasa Tabula*: Therefore, she could not exist before the Body. The *Major* is Evident. The *Minor* must be granted by Mr. *Le Grand* himself; for, the Soul can have no *Actual Knowledge*, without *Ideas*; and, he denies she has any *Innate Ideas*, but only an *Innate Power* of producing them; that is, she has, according to him, none at all before she had elicited them out of her self: Therefore, she was, according to *some Priority*, before she did elicit them, or, before she had any Knowledge; and, consequently, she was, of her self, only a *Power* to have them; or, a meer *Power* to have Knowledge; which is, to be utterly *Indeterminate*, in *Ratione Cognoscitivi*: But, what is *Indeterminate* in any kind, is neither *This*, nor *That*; nor, consequently, can exist: Therefore, there can be no *Pre-Existence* of Souls. What answers he to these Arguments? We must excuse him; 'Tis not his Custom to do such trifling Work, as to answer any Argument

gument at all: 'Tis enough for him to stand stiff to his *Cartesian* Tenet, that the *Soul* and *Body* are *Two Things*; I, that they are, let Arguments say what they will. However, he will do better than Answering Arguments: And, *How is that?* Why, he'll make them all Bad Christians, and Hereticks, that speak against *Cartesius*; which no sooner said, but, in his wise Opinion, down they go to the Pit of Hell, like so many Imps of *Lucifer*, as they are: They deny the Immortality of the Soul, and the Resurrection; and there is an end of them. And, Is not this Confutation enough in all Conscience!

65. His Follies here were tedious to Enumerate. He yields, with much ado, what the Council of *Vienna* told him 'twas *Heretic* to deny; but he yields it very faintly, in these Words; *Anima* (says he) *Hominis Forma aliquando dici potest*: The Soul may sometimes be call'd a Form of Man. The Council is much bound to him for his Civil Complement; and *Cartesius* is their most humble Servant, but not so Obedient to its Decrees of Faith as he ought. But, What kind of Form is the Soul then? The Council said, it was such, *verè & essentialiter*; and, if it were Truly such, why may not a Truth, that belongs to Faith, be spoke at all times? Why, only, [*dici potest*, It may be said;] as if it were some

Im-

*Improper and Unusual Phrase, and not-Proper Language, in which Declarations of Faith use to be worded? Why aliquando only? May not Truth be spoke Always, as oft as there is Occasion? Well, but, all this while, what kind of Form is it? He tells us here, p. 78. l. 18, 19, 20. Is it neither an Assistant, or Extrinsic Form; nor an Informing, or Intrinsic one? Now, Intrinsic means Not-Extrinsic: We should be glad, then, to see this Monster of a Form, that is neither Extrinsic, nor Not-Extrinsic. What is this Midling Form then? He gives us no Account of it, but that 'tis alterius Generis, Of another Kind; quo fit, ut Hominis Formam Humanitatem esse strictius asseramus; By which it comes to pass, that we more strictly call the Form of Man Humanity. What Gibberish is this? Is the Soul a Form at all, or no? If not, then he must say the Council errs: If it be, what is the Matter to this Form? Or, Is it neither Intrinsic, nor Not-Intrinsic to it? A Form that is not Intrinsic to the Matter, or Informs it, is a strange kind of Form. Again; What Sense is it, that Humanity is, by the Soul, more strictly made the Form of Man! One would think, that this being the Abstract Notion of Man, its Concrete, and that which expresses his Total Essence, should be so more strictly ally'd to it, by the very Notion.*

tion of it, (as *Whiteness* is to that which is *White*,) that nothing could make a Man more strictly call'd a Man, than *Manhood*, or *Humanity*, can do of it self. So that, *Insignificant Words* and *Contradictions* are obtruded upon us, instead of *Solid Reasons*; and we must be content with them, when no better can be had.

66. As for his pretending I hold, the Soul is *ex traduce*, and not *Created*, he goes against the Light of his own Conscience: For, whoever reads my Fourth Preliminary to *Solid Philosophy*, §§. 8, 9. (as 'tis evident he *has*, since he *cavils* at that Book,) will see, I make the Soul come *immediately* from GOD, and *Created*; tho, indeed, the whole Man not being properly *Created*, but, in part (*viz.* according to its Body) *Generated*, the Infusion of the Soul is call'd by the Schools, not simply *Creation*, but *Concreation*; meaning, that the Soul is *then* Created, when, by *Generation*, the Bodily Part is brought to that Perfection, as to be fit, in some degree, to work with it. This, then, is another piece of their *New Cartesian Method*; and would serve for *Arguing* and *Answering* both, and do mighty Execution in *Running down* their Adversary, if they happen to meet with Ignorant and Credulous Readers, who are so weak, as not to consider that Imputations of the *Largest Size* may



may as well proceed from *Confident Calumny*, as from *Honest Ingenuity*.

67. Another New Method of my *Cartesian* Adversary, is, to cite Scripture, then interpret it by his own Fancy, without giving us any *Rule* of interpreting it; or, of distinguishing *Metaphorical* Speeches, from *Literal* ones; but, taking every Word that serves his purpose, or seems to chime to the *Cartesian* Novelty, in a *Dogmatical Rigour*; (which Method, follow'd home, would make mad Work with Philosophy, and Divinity too;) and then, if we will not allow his *Private* and *Untoward* Interpretations, presently to *exclaim* aloud, and tell the Reader very *sadly*, that I oppose not only *Cartesius*, but *Moses*, *St. John*, and *St. Paul*; nay, *GOD* himself, and (which is a worse Fault, it seems, than to oppose *GOD*) *the Holy Ghost* too; and, p. 47. *St. Jude* also. Certainly, this Self-conceited Man makes account his *Private* Interpretation of Scripture is the *Infallible Rule* of *all* our *Faith*; and, therefore, all Mankind must be *Bad Christians*, and *Hereticks*, that contradict such a Supernaturally-Gifted Interpreter. What a clutter does he keep with the Word [*sterisse*?] And, that 'tis against all Arts and Sciences, and Common Sense too, to say a Thing did not *stand* before it *fell*; as we both hold of the  
Angels,

Angels, That there was some *Terminus à quo*, or some kind of State, whence they tell, is certain, and undeniable. The Question is, *What* this State was? I took him to mean it was to see God; (and so did the Learned Merry-man too;) for, to say they were in Heaven, is the same, in Christian Language, as to say they enjoy'd the *Beatifical Vision*. Nor do I think any Man living will deny, but that our Saviour's Words, *In the House of my Father are many Mansions*, (one of which Mansions he assign here, p. 47. l. 25. as a *Celestial Habitation* to the Devils, before their Fall,) was meant of the *Stations*, or *Degrees*, of *Essential Happiness*, in the Sight of GOD; for, no Man will deny, but that 'tis *there* he told his Disciples, *he went to prepare a Place for them*. Now, since Mr. Le Grand calls the *House* which our Saviour calls here *his Father's*, [*Heavenly*,] what I want to know, is, what he means by this *House*, if it be not the Heaven of the Blessed Saints, who enjoy GOD. He makes it another thing; and says, that they are *thence promoted*, and *admitted more fully to the Beatifical Vision*. What means [*promoted*, and *admitted more fully to see GOD*,] but, that they saw him *before*, tho' not *so fully*? If so, and, that this was really his Tenet formerly, as I suspected, then my Argument proceeds  
against

against it thus: *If they saw GOD, they were Happy; If Happy, they had all they could wish; If they had all they could wish, they could wish no more, nor love any Created Good inordinately; nor, consequently, Sin, nor be Damn'd: Therefore, they did not absolutely stare; that is, they were not absolutely in Termino, or in Heaven.* I am half afraid, that, from the Words *Mansion, Domicilium*, and such like, which they *left*, he conceits there are certain kinds of *Upper-Rooms*, and *Lower-Rooms*, in Heaven; and, that *Lucifer*, and his Adherents, dwelt in some of the *Lowest*; and were there *besieg'd*, and *driven thence* by *St. Michael* and his Angels. Some may think this is too much *strain'd*, and looks as if I spoke in *Jest*: But I am very *Serious*; and, can see no Reason in the World that is *Solid*, or taken out of the Nature of our Subject, *Angels*; why he, who assigns to them, [*Before and After,*] which are the Proper Differences of *Time*, should not assign to them *Local Habitations*, and *Places* too: And, I should be much oblig'd to that Man, who would shew me, *out of the Nature of the Thing*, why Angels, which are *Pure Acts*, should not have the *One*, as well as the *Other*; or, why they should not be *Contain'd* in, or *Commensurate* to *Place*, which is *Permanent Quantity*; as well as their Operations,

by

by being *one after another*, should be *Commensurate to Time*, which is *Successive Quantity*; both of them being equally *Opposite*, nay, *Contradictory* to the Nature of *Indivisible Beings*.

68. To clear this Point, which is much blunder'd by *Metaphorical Words*, which are *Equivocal*; First, It is Certain there was some *Condition, State, or Terminus à quo*, from which they fell. Secondly, That Words which signify *Place*, when apply'd to *Spirits*, are, and can only be meant, of *States, or Conditions*; that is, of *Exalted Knowledge*; *Ignorance* of what they longingly wish to know; of *Extreamly Tormenting Grievs, Blissful Joys, or Suspended Hope*, which is also very *Penal*. Thirdly, That *Aquinas* (*Pr. Q. 62. a. 1.*) maintains, that Angels were Created by GOD *Happy, Beatitudine naturali*; or, in that *Happiness* which they could have by the Force of their Nature, (which is, in some sort, call'd *Happiness, or Felicity*;) in which Sense, *Aristotle* said, that the *Utmost Happiness* of Man was, to contemplate the *Optimum Intelligibile, GOD*. This *Beatitude* (says he) *Angels* have by their Creation, because they cannot acquire it by *Discourse*, but 'tis given them for the *Dignity* of their Nature. But there is another *Beatitude* plac'd in the seeing *GOD's Essence*, which is not within the *Limits* of Nature, but is the *End* of Nature; which, therefore

fore, they had not by their Creation.. Besides, 'tis probable they had some *Grace*, and some *Gratuitous Knowledge*, beyond what their meer Nature gave them; which *Grace* they resisted. These Gifts made them Candidates for Heaven; in which, the *First Act* of their Will would have invested them. This was their State, or Condition, from which they fell: This *Hope* and fair Possibility, and (as it were) Title to Heaven, they lost by their *First wicked Choice*: And, This, according to this Learned Saint, is all that is meant by the *Domicilium*, (which so much puzzles Mr. *Le Grand*,) which they forfeited by their Deprav'd Will, and Unhappy *Wilfulness*.

69. But, does Mr. *Le Grand* imagine there goes no more to the Interpretation of Scripture, than a *hasty Fancy* of our own? I know he is resolv'd to like nothing that comes from me: However, I will acquaint the Readers with my Thoughts, hoping it make some of them more Charitable, than to *Censure* highly, and *Condemn* one another, because they interpret Scripture otherwise than themselves do. I conceive then, that in Passages belonging to *Faith*, Scripture is to be interpreted, as Mr. *Thorndike* (*Just Weights and Measures*, p. 37.) also holds, by what the Church, from the Beginning, has receiv'd by  
their

*th. ii.* (the Pastors) Hands. In Matters that belong to *Natural Subjects*, *True Science* is the best Means to interpret it; because, *Words* (in a Book intended only for Faith and Good Works, and not for Natural Speculation) may be *Ambiguous*; but a *Demonstration*, if truly such, cannot deceive us. Thus, when 'tis said, that GOD made *Two Great Lights*, the Words would make us think that the *Moon* is the *Greatest*, next to the *Sun*, in the Firmament; but the Science of *Astronomy* corrects that Thought, and assures us, it is the *Least* within our Ken. Particularly, *True Science* of the Natures of Things enlightens us to know when Words that relate to them are to be taken in a *Literal*, when in a *Metaphorical* Sense; but, most especially, when the Speech is of *Spiritual* Natures; which, if we should understand *Literally*, it would make us entertain a thousand *Frantick Conceits*, unworthy GOD Almighty, or Angels either; as every one knows. This determin'd, and that 'tis once known the Words are meant *Literally*, then *Criticism*, which acquaints us in what Sense they us'd to be understood by those who liv'd about the same *Time* and *Place*, will give us great Light. If *Metaphorically*, then *Logic* will assist us to know in what Regard, and for what Reason, the Word is transferr'd from one thing

thing to *another*; and, to gather by the *Tenour* or *Consequence* of the Discourse, the Sense of the whole Passage. Nor is *Grammar* useless in what concerns the *Congruity* of the Words which compound the Sentence and Context. This, and such other Considerations, if Mr. *Le Grand* would please to lay to heart, he would not immediately pronounce, and conclude, that every Interpretation that suits not with his *Fancy*, or with the *Ideas* of *Cartesius*, (the Agreeableness or Disagreeableness to which seem to be his *Rule* of Interpreting Scripture,) to be such heinous Sins (as he does, *p.* 15.) against *Moses*, *St. John*, *St. Paul*, *St. Jude*, nay, against *GOD himself*, and (which is an odd Addition) against the *Holy Ghost* too. (Had I said so, he would have objected, that 'tis a Clear Case I do not hold the *Holy Ghost* to be *GOD*.) By which Method, he assumes to himself a Prerogative to make more *Decrees of Faith* in a *Moment*, than all the *General Councils*, since the Christian Church stood, have made in Sixteen Hundred Years, with all their *Disquisitio Magna*. But, I doubt, he will find few that will subscribe to his *New Symbolum Fidei*, or his *New Articles of Faith*, no better grounded; nor believe (however their *Science*, according to *Malbranche*, comes by *Divine Revelation*) that their *New Faith* hath such a Supernatural and Sacred Original.



70. I had forgotten a very smart Confutation of his, put down largely, p: 125. which is the more Victorious, because my *own Words* are brought to tell me to my Face, that I *eat* them. The Point was this: A *Syllogism* being the most Exact of Discourses, out of which some *Determinate* Conclusion follows, from the placing of the *Terms*; hence, in my *METHOD*, B. 3. L. 1. where I treated of the *Figure* of a *Syllogism*, which consists in the *Placing* the *Two Extremes* with the *Middle*, so that some *Determinate* Conclusion might ensue thence, I advanc'd this Proposition, that therefore the two last Figures were Unnatural, and Illogical. My Reason given there, §§. 10, 11, 12. was, because the Place of the *Predicate* being that which belongs to *Superiour* Notions, and the Place of the *Subject* (as the Word imports) being that which suits best with *Inferiour* ones; and, it being *Natural*, that that which *conjoins Two*, should be placed in the *Middle*, between them; it was most Unnatural, that the *Middle-Term* should be plac'd so as to be *Predicated*, or *Above them both*, as 'tis in the *Second Figure*, where 'tis *twice Predicated*; or *Below them both*, as in the *Third*, where 'tis *twice the Subject*: whence, the *Middle-Term* is, in neither of those Figures, in the *Middle*. Hence, in my §. 15. I advance this farther

ther Consequence ; [ Hence, no *Determinate* Conclusion can follow in either of the last Figures, from the Disposal of the Parts in the Syllogism : ] Which I repeat again, and farther explicate, in the next Page ; concluding thus, ( The *Indeterminate* Conclusion follows not from the Artificial Form of the Syllogism, but meerly from the Material Identity of all the Terms ; or from this, that their Notions were found in the same Ens. ] And, in Conformity to this Doctrine, I put Two Propositions only in each of those Figures, ( which I did no where else when I came to make Syllogisms, ) because no *Determinate* Conclusion follows thence ; as I declare my self, expressly, in the last Line of that Page. By which, any Man of Common Sense may see clearly, that the State of the Question is this, Whether any *Determinate* Conclusion follows in the two last Figures ; and this, from the Disposal of the Parts in the Syllogism. Whence, (*Id. Cart. p. 27.*) I challeng'd him, and all his *Cartesians*, ( as I do now again, ) *Ut ostendant, &c. That they would shew, out of the Nature of the Subject we are treating of, ( as they ought ; ) that is, out of the Artificial Frame of a Syllogism ; which would not be such as it ought to be, ( that is, Artificial, ) unless all the three Terms had a Determinate Place in it ; but, chiefly, out of the Placing of the Middle-Term,*

Term, and the Laws of Predicating; why One of the Extremes ought, in the Conclusion, to be Subject or Predicate, rather than the Other: Or, (which is the same,) why any Determinate Conclusion follows from such a Placing of the Terms. This is the Point truly stated from my Words, over and over repeated: This, then, he is to answer to, and to shew, that out of such a Placing of the Middle-Term, any Determinate Conclusion, that is, One of them rather than the Other, does follow. Now, let us see his Answer, and reflect upon his Method.

71. 'Tis found in his *Censura*, p. 125, 126. Where we may observe, First, That there is not *one Word* of either a Determinate Conclusion following thence, nor of following out of the Placing the Extremes with the Middle-Term in the Premisses; concerning which only the whole Question proceeds, as I over and over repeated. Whence follows that he has not spoke *one Word* to the purpose, in his whole Answer. 2. He says, *Turpiter lapsus est, He has fallen into a filthy Errour.* That is to be try'd, and determin'd, by the Solidity of his Answer. In the mean time, if my Position was an Errour, he has never so much as touch'd it, much less confuted it; since, 'tis evident, he has prevaricated from the whole Question. 3. He says, *I do calcare Aristotlem, trample upon Aristotle.*

Poor spiteful Trifler! Cannot I dissent from *Aristotle*, or any other Author, in *any one thing*, but I must presently *calcare, spernere, contemnere, damnare* those very Authors themselves? Did *Cartesius* *calcare, damnare, spernere*, &c. all the former World, when he introduc'd this New Doctrine of his, so *Different*, and, in most things, so *Opposite* to them all? 4. He says, I do *calcare Porphyrium*, *trample upon Porphyrius*; he means, in putting a *Sixth Predicable*, or Manner of Predicating: And, in case we allow *Identical Propositions*, without doing which, we must (as *Non Ultra* has demonstrated) renounce *First Principles*, it is Evident, that the Predicating the *Whole*, formally and expressly, of the *Whole*, is another Sort or Manner of Predicating, from *his Five*. Let him know then, once for all, that I am so far from standing Corrected, as to my *Luciferian Pride* and *Arrogancy*, notwithstanding his *Castigations*, (as he calls them,) that I value not a Pin what either *Aristotle*, *Porphyrius*, or any other Philosopher says, when I see an Evident Reason to the contrary; Since, 'tis only the Goodness of their *Reasons* that gave them all their Credit and Authority. 5. I had alledg'd I had *produced* no Syllogisms there at all; since a Syllogism consists of *Three Propositions*, whereas, I had manifestly put but *Two*; because

no

no *Determinate* Conclusion follow'd; and, I challeng'd him that himself had added a *Third*. What says he to this? Does not *Eye-sight*, and my *express Words* in that place, put this out of all Doubt, or Cavil? He reflects on it thus, *Que hæc hominis Impudentis Confidentia, &c.* What a strange Confidence is this of this Impudent Man, whose Mouth can by no other means be stopp'd, but by citing his own Words in English! And, immediately he puts down my very Words; in which are only Two Propositions, and not Three; without which last, there can be no Syllogism. His Rail- ing I pass over, and only desire the Reader to find a Word (if he can) to express fully the Humour of this Mad-man, who strives thus to cut-face Men's Eyes; and puts down my very Words here, which evidently confute himself. 6. He cites my Words in his *Censure*, p. 126. that the Conclusion may either be *This*, or the *Other*; and, as far as I can guess, (for I am loath to fix upon him absolutely such a prodigious piece of Nonsense) he thinks that, by these Words, I signifie, some *Determinate* Conclusion follows. Can any Man be so weak, as not to know that [Either the One, or the Other,] means, [Neither the One, nor the other, *Determinate*.y?] I see a thing a far off, and I say, 'Tis either a Man, or a Horse: Do I, in saying so, sig-

nise that it is *determinately* a Man, or *determinately* a Horse; when as my Words expressly speak *Indifferency*, or *Indetermination*, to either? Every Conclusion that is deduc'd, is some *One*; and, what is *One*, is *Determinate*; and, if it be not *Determinate*, or *One*, 'tis *None*; for, *None* signifies *No One*: Whence, I told him, (*Id. Cart. p. 26.*) [*Consultò abstinui ab ullâ Conclusionè inferendâ, eò quòd nullam Determinatam (seu quòd tantundem est Nullam) inde deduci aut sequi tum ostendi, tum disertè professus sum.*] What replies he to this, in which the Force of my Answer consists? Not *one Word*, nor so much as mentions it; but rambles on, after his own fashion; that is, *Concealing* all that is *to purpose*, or else *Perverting* it; and, then, making a wide Mouth over it, and Railing against it. Lastly, He will needs do Feats, and put the Syllogisms, [*clarius & distinctius,*] *more clearly and distinctly* than I did: Which is Ridiculous Bragging, and Nonsense to boot; for, (as Eye sight attests,) I put no Syllogisms at all; neither *Clearly*, nor *Obscurely*; neither *Distinctly*, nor *Confusedly*. I know he will still be *doing* twenty things he *should not do*, to avoid the doing what he *should do*. If he will be *doing*, let him shew that any *One* or *Determinate* Conclusion follows out of Terms no better placed in the Premisses; and this, *from the*  
*Dis-*

*Disposal of the Parts of the Syllogism*; which are my very Words, §. 15. But this he has not done, nor Attempted to do, nor so much as mention'd, or taken Notice of it, tho' it be the only Point; and, therefore, he has done nothing at all but *prevaricate*, *fool* and *rail*, and given no kind of Answer. To make this clearer; Let the three Terms be A B and C; of which, A is the *Majus Extremum*; B, the *Middle Term*; and C, the *Minus Extremum*. If A be predicated of B, that is, be *Above* it; and B be predicated of, or *Above* C; then it follows, *à fortiori*, out of the very Placing the Terms, that A, being the Supreme Notion, must be *above* C, or the Predicate in the Conclusion; and, so, a *Determinate Conclusion* follows, out of the Situation of the Terms: But, if A and C stand on the same Level, and be both of them either *Above* B, or both of them *Below* it; neither has any Title, by virtue of their Place, to be *above*, or *below*; that is, to be Predicate, or Subject, in the Conclusion; and, therefore, the Conclusion remains *Indeterminate*, or *No One*; that is, *None*. The rest is *Empty Vapouring*, [*turpissimè lapsus est*,] and such like stuff; his constant Assistant, when he is at a *Nonplus*. If any one have a Mind to have a List of his Swaggering and Ranting Vapour upon this Occasion, he may read them in



my *Ideæ Cartesiaue*, p. 27, 28. in these modest Terms, deliver'd in his own Words; [*Attend, you University-men; for, he would be your Master too--- This Inventor of this New Logick, or Method to Science--- See here his Syllogism--- (whereas, Eye-sight tells every Man, I put no Syllogism at all:)* ---*He makes himself Ridiculous--- He errs against the most known Rules of Syllogisms--- His Judgment, or Opinion, is Foolish--- He contemns every Man; nay, he blots out of the Catalogue of Philosophers, and makes a Mockery of the most Noble Sir Kenelm Digby, and Albion: (Which is most openly and ridiculously False, and Groundless; since the Former never writ any Logick, and the Later maintain'd the same Doctrine in this Particular.)* ---*His Syllogisms (he means, his own; for, I brought none at all) are Erroneous in more Respects than one--- These Rules, not only Sophisters, but almost Freshmen are well acquainted with--- He errs filthily--- He is a Cbler, beyond his Slipper--- He is an Ass, playing upon a Harp--- He bewrays his own Ignorance--- He is, in Logick, more blind than a Mole--- He deserves to be hiss'd at--- He will be Eternally famous for a Trifler.*] Now, would any Man imagin, that this Vapourer is, all this while, so utterly out, that (as has been now shewn) he has not so much as spoke one Syllable to the true Question; which is, Whether

a *Determinate* Conclusion follows in the Second and Third Figures, out of the *Placing of the Middle Terms with the Extremes*. By the way, observe, Gentlemen, with what meek and humble Spirits these Men are endow'd: They think, there is not the least Shew of Immodesty, or Incivility, in their Words; not, tho' they call me *Impudent* here, for saying what the very Words they cite shew to the Eye of every Reader. This Errour (forsooth!) was shewn me long ago, by his Friend, and Tutor, Mr. *Bisset*, after my Book was printed; who, out of his own wondrous Kindness to me, told me, he was sorry I had so strangely mistaken; and, as I am inform'd, he has objected it since, to some of my Friends; as a great Lapse: To rectifie whom, I have been something larger, in case he be not *past Rectifying*. But, of him, and all that has pass'd between us, more hereafter, as Occasion presents.

72. I cannot omit another Method of Solving my Demonstrations, 'tis so very pleasant. I had demonstrated in my *METHOD*, that all *Intrinsical* Differences were nothing but *more or less* of the *Generical* Notion; for, if they be *Intrinsical*, or keep *within* the Precincts of that *Common* Notion; that is, if they be not fetch'd from another Head, (which is, to be *Ex-*

*intrinsic*;) then, in case they did *equally* partake the *Genus*, the *One* of the *Species* (they being, both of them, constituted by their Differences) would have in it nothing *particular to it self*; or, have nothing in it, but *just the same* the Other had; and, so, they could not differ *Intrinsically* from one another: Whence follows, that the *Intrinsic Differences*, by which they formally differ, can be no other but an *Unequal* Participation of the Common Notion; that is, *more and less* of it. What says he to this Clear Demonstration? Not a Word. 'Tis his Prerogative, never to regard the *Argument*. He *denies* my *Conclusion*, as he does almost *always*, quite thorow his whole Answer; and, he never fails of having something or other to say against *That*: And, to let the Reader see here it cannot stand, he brings no less Artillery than *Omnipotence* against it: *What!* (says he,) *Is it Impossible, then, for GOD, whose Power he is not Willing to Obey,* (that Unchristian Slander must come in of Course,) *to make two Species, or Individuums, that Equally participate their Superiour Notion? Is it Impossible for GOD to cause two Things, or Modes, or two Eggs, not to be Essentially unequal, since they all depend on GOD.* Now, there is not one Word in my Argument, that relates, in the least, to *GOD's Omnipotence*, more than there is in

in any of *Euclid's* Demonstrations, or any other Argument whatsoever, brought by any other Philosopher : So that, this Answer is *equally* applicable to *them*, as to *this* of *mine*. And, is not this a most *Formidable Method*, and, withall, very *Expedite*, to Answer all the Arguments in the World ! *viz.* If they who alledge them, offer to say they *conclude*, he tells them, in short, that they *deny GOD's Omnipotence*, that they are *not willing to obey his Power*--- on which all things *depend*; and, therefore, are *Impious* against *GOD*, if they will not grant, their Argument may, possibly, *not Conclude*, or be Good for Nothing ! What Man living dares deal with such an Adversary, who has *Omnipotence*, in all Exigencies, still at hand, to befriend him ? This is their constant Topick ; and, tho' he uses it never so oft, it will never be worn thread-bare. Certainly, that *Sacred* Attribute was never so *Prophan'd*, as by these Men, who make it perpetually an *Excuse* for their *Ignorance*, and a *Cloak* for their *Malice*. *Cartesius* could dare *Omnipotence* to do his worst, to deceive him ; *Med. 2. Nunquam (says he) efficiet Deceptor ille summè Potens ut nihil sim, quamdiù me aliquid esse cogitabo* ; and, yet, is *Applauded* for it : But others cannot bring a Plain Demonstration, but we are presently *bobbed* in the Mouth with *denying Omnipotence*.

But,

But, the Question is not, whether *Omnipotence* can solve it; but, whether Mr. *Le Grand* can. In the mean time, What Answer does he himself give to my Argument, which, in short, is this, If the *Species* do not partake the Generical Notion *Unequally*, One has nothing in it under that *Genus*, but what the *Other* has: If it has nothing in it, as under that *Genus*, but what the *Other* has, it does not differ from it, as under that *Genus*: If it do not differ from it under that *Genus*, then 'tis One and the same with it under that Consideration, and not Two; v. g. Two Yards being *Equal* under the Notion of Quantity, they do not Differ, that is, they are the *Self-same* under the Notion of Quantity, *precisely*: Which is as certain as this Identical, into which it is refunded, viz. *A Yard is a Yard*. Now, would I give something to be present when Mr. *Le Grand* puts on his Considering-Cap, and bethinks him what to say to this Demonstration: I expect he will laugh at it, as meer Gibberish; (that we may be sure of.) for, he has a perfect Antipathy against all *Connected Discourse*; and, if the Connexion be *Close*, he falls into a Paroxysm of *Railing*; but, if the Evidence of it be driven to *Identical Propositions*, then his Reason falls into a Swoon, and is perfectly *Entranc'd*; nor can any thing cure him, or furnish him with any kind of Answer, but

to

to have recourse to the Divine Omnipotence, for Relief; and then he is *Enchanted*, and *Proof* against all the Demonstrations in the World; and, will either pretend an *Identical* Proposition may be *False*; or tell his Adversary, that GOD's Omnipotence can make his Argument not conclude; and, that he is *Unwilling* to acknowledge and obey GOD's Power, if he will needs stand to his Argument, Was ever Man so Nonpluss'd, and Baffl'd.

73. Another most remarkable Instance of his *Exactness* in Solving my Demonstrations, (and 'tis a very *Compendious* and *Admirable* one,) shall be, his *Skiping* over Multitudes of them, very *Nimbly*, at one *Leap*. In my *Appendix*, which confuted his false Pretence of holding *Formal Mutation*, (without which, all *Physicks* and *Metaphysicks* are meer Nonsense,) I had shewn how he spoke *Contradictions* in every Step he took; v. g. How he made [*Intrinfecal*] to be [*Extrinfecal*;] [*Substantial*,] or [*Essential*,] to be the same as [*Accidental*;] The Producing a new Substance, or *Ens*, call'd [*Generation*,] to be meerly [*Location*,] or [*Situation*] of many things orderly together, which belong to another Head, or Predicament; and, consequently, is no *Generation*. How he makes [*Unum*, or *One*,] to be [*Non-Unum*, or *Multa*;] that is, *Not-One*, but *Many*;

Many; and *Ens*, or *Thing*, to be *Entia*, or *Things*. How he so abus'd the Notions of [*Simplex*] and [*Compositum*,] that he made them to be the *Same*, under the same Notion. How he made *Complectum*, and *Incomplectum*, to be the self-same. How he confounds the Commonest Notions of *Actus* and *Potentia*, and destroys both their Natures; which contradicts all *Learned*, and, even, all *Common* Discourse. How he makes what is ] *Divisible*, ] to be *no way* *Divisible*, or, [*not-Divisible*.] How he puts that to be *Physical*, (which belongs to a *Distinct* Science from the *Mathematicks*,) to be *Mathematical*; that is, *Not-Physical*. How he makes [*meer Matter*,] which, as such, is contradistinguished to *Form*, (as the Principle of *Potentiality* and *Indetermination* is to that Principle which is *Actuating*, or *Determinative*,) to be [*In-form'd*;] and that too *Essentially*. How he makes [*Suppositions*] (on which *Cartesius* proceeds) to be [*Principles*,] and relies on them as *such*; which are not only *No Principles*, but *Contradictorily Opposite* to the whole Nature and Essence of *Principles*. All which, and much more, I objected, and prov'd, against him, (at least, all but this last,) by *Mediums*, fetch'd from *Metaphysics*, which are *next to Self-evident*, and border upon the very *First Principles* of all; or, on *Identical Propositions*, to which  
also



also I did, by the way, reduce some of them. What Answers he to this large Discourse, consisting of thirty five Pages, which demonstrates how he had stumbl'd into *Flat Nonsense*, every Step he took? Read, Gentlemen; and admire the profound Learning of my Adversary, and his Dexterity in Solving my Arguments. He answers all those Demonstrations (O wonderful!) in less than a *Page and a half*. But, *How*? Does he shew they proceed upon *Unevident Principles*, or *False and Unprov'd Suppositions*; or, that the Terms I use in my Discourse, are *Unconnected*? No, no; all these are *meer Fooleries* with him: This is none of his Methods. How, then, does he Answer them? Why, First, (*Censura*, p. 128.) he *prefaces* confidently, (which is no small Part of his Method of Answering,) and says, *Expectandum erat, ut Vires suas omnes in eâ* (he means his Appendix) *confutanda eliceret*: It was to be expected he would have exerted his whole Force, in Answering my Appendix. Well! But, does he reply to my Answer, tho' never so negligently and carelessly written? that is to be yet examin'd. Secondly, He proceeds, *At prob hominis Ignavi Imperitium! hic, ceriè, si usquam, nugatur egregiè*: Oh, the Unskilfulness of this Slothful Man! Here, if ever, he trifles egregiously. These are, hitherto, but *Bold Sayings*. What is his Answer?

*swer* ? Why, he says, that I bring a *Physi- cal Discourse* to the *Ten Predicaments*; to *Genus and Species*; to *Ens* and *Unum*, *Abstractions*, and *Logical Trifles*. Indeed, in *one Page*, (235.) where I am stating the *Question*, I make a small *Logical Discourse*, to shew under what a precise *Consideration* we speak of our *Subject*; thus to be- get a *Clear and Distinct Conception*, what *Forms or Modes* are *Intrinsical*, what *Ex- trinsical*: But, my *Reader* will see, that all my *Mediums* are either taken from *Phy- sicks*, or from *Metaphysics*. And, 'tis to these *Mediums*, we would have an *Answer*. Does he shew that I deviate from the *Nature of the Thing* in hand? Do I not hold to the *Notions of Ens, Unum, Matter, Form* ? &c. Alas ! he never minds such *frivolous Considerations*. Thirdly, He says, I tell my *Reader*, my *Peripateti- cal Assertions* are not *suppos'd gratis*, but *De- monstrated*. Does he go about to prove the *Contrary* ? He not so much as attempts it. To what end, then, does he bring such *Stuff* ? Oh ! 'tis a necessary *Ingre- dient* of his *Method*, to tell us at large *what I say*; for, that makes a *Shew*, as if he were about to *confute* me; and, when he has done, he lets it all alone, and slides away to another thing; which is his *General Trick*, all over. He is true to *one part of his Title*, which is, *Censura*; for, he

he *Censures* very *Notably*: But, he never promis'd he would give a Reason, *Why*; and, he will not go beyond his Promise, or his Bargain. Fourthly, He says, I would have the Readers believe that the Words [*Divisibility, Physical, Matter, &c.*] are *Abus'd* by him. He mistakes; I would not have any Readers of mine *believe* any Tittle, upon my *Word*; but, see with the *Eye* of their own Reason, that my Arguments *prove* what I pretend, to be True. But, were it so; Does he even *attempt* to shew that my Arguments do *not conclude*; and, by doing so, to preserve my Readers from the Mischief of Assenting to my *Impious* Doctrine? Methinks, his Charity to his Neighbour should oblige him to *Endeavour* this, at least: But, he begs their Excuse; he must not run to *New* and *Troublesome* Methods, and leave *his own*, which never yet fail'd him, and is, withall, so *Easie*. By which, every one will see, that his *Policy* is much greater than his *Charity*. After this, he surceases his Impugnation of my Arguments; and ends with calling them *Cavils*, which, he says, he has *satisfy'd* formerly; but he neither *tells* his Reader, nor *can* tell him, *Time*, nor *Place*, when, or where, he thus satisfy'd the Debt he ow'd him; and, therefore, the Obligation remains yet *in Force*. Then he says, I neglect his *Observations*, (the worthy Transcriptions.

scriptions of his profound *Note-Book-Learning*,) which may sometimes (if they be Pertinent, and Authentick) be brought against a *Conclusion*; but can, with no Sense, be pretended fit to *solve Arguments*, or shew the Terms *Unconnected*. Besides, I have laid open, how Insignificant the Way of Observations or Experiments are, (when we are *laying Grounds* of Philosophy,) at the End of my Preface to my *METHOD*. He brings up all, with sounding his Noble Triumph over my Demonstrations, and then concludes it with a little Pedantick Foolery, which are great Embellishments through his whole Books; and, tells his Reader, like a right Solid Philosopher, as he is, that the *Mountains* Brought forth, and were Deliver'd of a *Ridiculus Mus*. Yet, tho' he has, with a wonderful Agility, *skipp'd over* all those Demonstrations against his *Appendix*, at once, without either *touching* or *mentioning any one* of them; yet, he tells us, for all that, (p. 20.) very briskly, and confidently, *Appendicem meam, ab omnibus ejus ictibus sartam tectam, tuebor: I will defend my Appendix, safe and sound, against all his Assaults*. And, in one Sense, he says very true; for, certainly, never did Man, in the World, make *such* a Defence against so many Demonstrations: One would think that, to *avoid* them all, and *run away* from them all,

is a strange Way of *Defending* them all. But, these *Cartesian* Methods of theirs can do more than *Miracle*. This *Prevarication* of his from *performing* one jot of what he had so *largely promis'd*, would be enough to make any *Writer*, but himself, lose his *Credit* utterly; and so it would *his* too, but that he is *Proof* against it, having *none to lose*: For, he has us'd us to it so often, that none now expects it. By the same *Nimble Method*, he leaps over my whole 4th *Indication*, without replying one Word to those most *Important* *Objections*: See his *Censura*, p. 36. where he gives them their *Quick Dispatch*, in *Ten Lines*, by virtue of the *same Method*; which deserves to be call'd, *The New Cartesian Method of EXPEDITION*.

74. In the self-same Method he answers my *Demonstration*, (*Id. Cart. p. 127, &c.*) which prov'd, the *Cartesians* had *no Principles of Knowing*; my *Five Demonstrations*, which shew'd their *First Principle of Knowing* (consisting in this, That the *Soul* had a *Power to Elicit Ideas* out of her self) was *Contradictory* to the *First Principles* of our *Understanding*; and *Three* more against the *Insignificancy* of the *Occasional Impression* upon the *Nerve*, whence, as they say, those *Ideas* come to be *Elicited*; and yet *Three* more, against the *Pretence* of *Annexing* such and such *Ideas* to such *Motions*.

*Motions* made upon the Nerve, by GOD's *meer Will*, as they pretended, but never yet *prov'd*. Now, this *Expedite Way* of Answering serves them as well for These, as it did for the Former; and is *equally fit* to solve all the Demonstrations in the whole World: 'Tis but calling them *Trifles*, *Cavils*, and *Ridiculous Mice*; and, immediately, all the Connexion of Terms in them, and all the Consequences deduc'd from them, tho' never so *Strict*, and *Close*, will fly quite *asunder*, and they are all *shatter'd* into *Loose*, *Incoherent Talk*, by the Miraculous Virtue of this All-answering, All-confuting Method. Yet, he tells his Reader, in his *Ad Lectorem*, that *Omnibus Adversarii Objectionibus satis abundè factum inveniet*; that he will find all the Objections of his Adversary sufficiently and abundantly Answer'd. Whereas, whoever reads my *Idea Cartesiana*, will discern, that he has not so much as mention'd the Tenth part of what he ought to have Reply'd to, and Confuted. He tells him also, that *Nihil intantum reliquit*, which was not *Futile ac Ridiculum nimis*; He has left nothing Untouch'd, but that which is very Babbling, and Ridiculous. And, this is another Answer to all my Demonstrations; for, these are the Things he has most carefully, and most exactly left Untouch'd, (tho' he handles *Wrangling Trifles* very largely:) Or, if,

by

by Accident, he happ'd to Touch them, he first *defiles* and *perverts* them, as he thinks fit; and then he musters, and brings up his little Army of his *New Methods*, to *Attack* them.

75. But, What is become of those Categorical Propositions, all this while, into which I had reduc'd his *Loose Ramble*, as into the *Principles* which, I saw, lay at the bottom of his *Respective Discourses*, and grounded the several parts of them. I had collected them with much *Exactness*, and referr'd to the Places where it would appear, that they were the *Foundations* on which he built all his *Incoherent* and *Artificial Superstructures*. I did this, to oblige him to aim his *Random-Talk* at some *Certain* and *Determinate Mark*; and, that, by seeing what he was to *prove*, he might, at length, be forc'd to bring some *Determinate Arguments*, to make them good. I was so far from *Imposing* them, that (*Id. Cartes. pag. 111, 112.*) I left it at his Choice, either to *Grant* or *Deny* them: If he *Granted* them, then he was to *maintain* them; If he *Deny'd* them to be his Sense, then I undertook to *shew* that he would, by *doing so*, *overthrow* all his own Doctrine which was *Grounded* on them: But, he will not so much as take Notice of any one of them; only, he tells his Reader, they are *Theses Fictitiae*, and *Fidelitate nulla*



*nulla collectæ: Fictitious Positions, and Unfaithfully Collected.* If so, I had given him the greatest Advantage against me, he could ever hope to gain. However, if *none of his*, and, that therefore he could not Grant them, he might have Deny'd them: But he fore-saw the Consequence, and, that I could easily fix them upon him; and, that those Positions he had made use of for his Principles, were such *Shameful Nonsense*, that nothing could be more Opprobrious to him, than to be Convicted to have built all his Doctrine upon such Chimerical Grounds. He fore-saw too, that these scurvy *Categorical Propositions* use to have some kind of Coherence in them, and so might hap to bring our Dispute into that abominable Way of *Connexion*; and, thence, might oblige him to bring *Arguments* to prove them; which would require much more Trouble, and Pains, than *meer Saying* would do; and, withall, would put him quite out of all his *Friendly Methods*, which had supported him hitherto, and were still his *only Refuge*: And, therefore, he very fairly and and prudently let them *all* alone; only, he tells us they are *Fictitious, and Unfaithfully Collected*; and there's an end of them. For, he thinks, Good Man! that whatever he *Says*, is *Prov'd*, as if he thought he could *Create and Uncreate Arguments*,  
(and

(and Answers too,) with only *saying* they were *Naught*. And, 'tis Unconscionable to *expect more* from a Man, who has *no more to give us*.

76. In the next Rank of his *New Methods*, march his *Follies*; and, first, for Dignity sake, come forward his *Learned Ones*, as those that should aim at having some Speculative Truth in them; viz. *Pag. 74.* he puts upon me to hold, that Creation is *Essential to GOD*; a Tenet I ever abhorr'd, and have laid Grounds to confute such a Senseless Opinion in my *METHOD, B. I. L. 7. §. 12.* And, for what Reason does he impose it upon me, to hold such an Impious Tenet? Because I say there are no *Different Points* in Eternity, or *before* the World was made; by the Distances from which, we may frame to our selves any Notion of *Sooner*, or *Later*; alledging, that *these* were Differences of Time, which could not be, till Time it self was; nor could Time be, till the *World was*. Which *Thesis* has no more Connexion with Creation's being *Essential to GOD*, than the Tenet of the Extension of Body is to the First Chapter in *Genesis*; or, that of the *Four Elements* is to *Algebra*. Whence, all his Discourse, *pag. 77.* by which he would seem to oppose me, is wrong levelled. Again; Since all Common Notions have their Original from our observing many

many Individuals agreeing in the *same* Nature; which, when *All* agree in it, we call it a *Summum Genus*; if *very many* only, then a *Species*; and so we descend to Inferiour Kinds, or Species; which Species are *Intrinsically Constituted* by partaking Unequally the Superiour, or Common Notion; as I have Demonstrated, and shewn by Instances, in my *METHOD*, B. I. L. 3. to §. 11. Again; Since it is not every *Indeterminate*, or *very small* Degree of *magis* and *minus*, or of Unequal Participation of the Genus, which constitutes or makes divers sorts of Mankind, or denominates it to be *another Kind*; but, the Distance between them must be *Conspicuous*, and very *Notorious*; and, under the Species of *Man*, there are found great Multitudes that do partake the Notion of *Rational*, (which is *Essential* to *Man*,) both in their *Intellectuals*, and *Morals*, and this from their Natural Constitution, or Genius, *above others*; so that they seem, in a manner, *Angelical*, in respect of them; and the other, Comparatively, in a manner, *Brutal*. Hence, I advanc'd this Paradox, That *there may be such Degrees of more and less Rational* found in Mankind, so that some of them may seem to be *another Species, Sort, or Kind* of Men (for those three Words are Equivalent) from the other: Nay, the Nature-taught Vulgar, following

ing their Genuin Thoughts, use to call them so too: As, when they say, [*He is another Kind of Man than you imagine;*] meaning thereby, *more Rational*, or (which is the same) a Man of better Judgment, or more Vertuous. What does Mr. Le Grand? Instead of Confuting my Principle, or Examining my Reason, he falls to to talk of *Lunar-men*, or *Men in the Moon*, and the other Stars; and tells me, *lest* (as he says) *I should be ignorant of it*, (How infinitely am I bound to him for Enlightening me!) what Authors have thought there were Men there. Then he talks also of *Planetary-men*, and tells us fine things of them too. Which done, he says, *If I am too dull to understand these Astronomical Observations*, (that is, which he had not made himself, but pick'd them out of Books, which he thinks to be a Work of Great Learning,) *he desires I would shew my self a Divine, and answer to his Question, Whether I hold that there are any Pre-Adamites, or no?* Why, this is pure Bedlam! What have I to do with the *Men in the Moon*, the *Planetary Gentlemen*, or the *Pre-Adamites*? Not a Word to this purpose is found in any of my Books. I spoke only of our honest Neighbours here, in our *Earth*; where there are many, *ex ipsâ naturâ*, as Dull as Beetles; and, *naturally*, as Immoral as Brutes: Others, *vel ex*

*ipsa Origine*, (that is, *Essentially*,) of a high pitch of Knowledge, and inclin'd to *Vertue*; and both naturally dispos'd to see Truth clearly, and to pursue it in their *Practice* sincerely: Whereas, Others can scarce see as far as their Nose; and have such weak Eyes, that they are blear'd, and be darken'd, if any Evident or Connected Truth is propos'd to them; which is the greatest Depravation of Rational Nature, (as far as 'tis *Intellectual*,) that can be imagin'd, in regard all Truth consists in *Connexion* of our Notions: Which Men do therefore seem to be another *Species*, or (as we say) another Kind of Men, as to their *Rationality*, than Others are. You will say, These are only divers *Qualities* in those Men, which do not infer divers *Species*. I reply, That, if they do concern their very *Power* of Reasoning, or their *Rationality*, which is their *Essence*; and, that they have this from their *Primordial Constitution*, in the very Instant they are made *Individually* such; (which is always *Essential*, because it distinguishes them from other Individuals.) Also, if *Nobilitas Animarum sequitur ex Nobilitate Corporum*; The Nobility (or Excellency) of Souls follows out of the Nobility (or Excellency) of the Body, (as St. Thomas of Aquin says, *Prim. Q. 83. q. 7.*) then this Difference between such two Men is not only a Diversity in some

Qua-

Quality, but *Essential*; and, therefore, in case there be many of each Sort, and so visibly Different, that we can abstract a Notion from those of each Sort, which is Common to all those under it, 'twill be a *Sub-Species*, or an Inferiour Kind of *Man*. But, could he have more discover'd his own Ignorance, than to call the Knowledge of *Men in the Moon*, and *Planetary-Men*, *Astronomical Observations*? What *Astronomy* treats of, is, the Motion of Celestial Bodies, their Bigness, Distance, the Times of their Appearances, their Influences, and the Respects they have to one another: But, that any Astronomer did ever observe, (as he says,) *Men in the Moon*, or in the other Planets, I confess my self too Dull to conceive, or to apprehend; nor, how any Man, not better-half Craz'd, could imagine they should.

77. Well, But the Question is, Whether there can be abstracted a Common Notion of a very notable Rationality from some Sort, or Kind of Men, which agrees to all *them*, and does not to another Sort, which are not, by their very *Intrinfecal* or *Essential* Constitution, near so Rational! If so, is not this all that is requisite to make a *Sub-species*? This being so, What says Mr. Le Grand to the Reason of it? Not a Word. Yet, he is never out, in his Way: For, as in the *Preface* to his former Book,



he did, upon this Occasion, instead of replying to the Argument, give us a most Learned Discourse of all sorts of *Dogs*; of *Generous Dogs*, *Clownish Dogs*, *Degenerate Dogs*, *Hunting Dogs*, *Hawking Dogs*; which he says, (contrary to the Notion of all Mankind,) that they differ only in some *Qualities*, and not in *Kind*; So, he tells us here, of *Lunar Men*, *Planetary Men*, and *Men before Adam*. For which he had two Reasons; One is, to talk *something*, lest Men should think he is *Nonplus'd*, tho' it be not one tittle to the purpose, or, in the least concerns my Argument. The other is, Because he had laid up in *Lavender* those *Pretty Collections* in his *Note-Book*; and it was a thousand pities the *World* should die in *Ignorance* of them, or himself lose the *Credit* due to the *great Sweat of his Brain*, and most profound *Learning*, in *Reading* and *Transcribing* them.

78. But, this premis'd, Who can do less than admire at Mr. *Le Grand's* Assertion, p. 130? Three Propositions were exhibited to two *Sorbon Doctors*; and so perverted, and untowardly propos'd, that they seem'd plainly to say, that we must see the *Connexion of Terms* in those Propositions which express'd the *Articles* of *Christian Faith*; that is, that we must see the very *Mysteries* themselves *Demonstrated*, ere  
we



we ought to believe them; and, in *this* Sense they condemn'd them, as they clearly signify'd in their *Censure*. Now comes Mr. Le Grand, and tells us, p. 130. *Error ab Authore isto dicitur quicquid non exhibuit damnata illa olim Parisiis Terminorum Connexio*: J. S. calls every thing an *Error*, whatever that *Connexion* of *Terms* condemn'd formerly at Paris, does not exhibit. Is not this Pleasant? They condemn'd *not* the *Connexion* of *Terms*, even in the *Mysteries*; for, then they must condemn the *Truth* of all the *Mysteries* of Christian Faith: What they condemn'd, was, most *expresly*, the *Necessity* of our seeing this *Connexion* of the *Terms* in the *Mysteries themselves*, ere we ought to believe them; for, this excludes, or evacuates, the *Divine Authority*, in which only, and by relying on which, we see such Propositions to be *True*, or, their *Terms* to be *Connected*. Again; Does he think there is no *Connexion* of *Terms* in other things, but only in these? Does not all the *Truth* in all the *Sciences* in the *World*; nay, all the *Truth*, even, in all our *Discourses*, consist in this, that the *Terms* of the Propositions do cohere in *Sense*, or are *Connected*? Does he think that I account all these to be *Errors*? Which if I do, I must deny all my own *Arguments*, and all my *Thoughts*, which are *True*. No, no; that's not the

Business. This would be a most prodigious piece of Ignorance. But, his cruel Feud against *All Connexion*, and, particularly, that in my *Demonstrations*, is so Deadly, and Implacable, that he would persuade the Reader that those *Sorbon* Doctors did condemn *All Connexion* of Terms *whatsoever*; nay, the very *Way* of Discoursing *Connectedly*; that is, all the Deduced Truths, writ by all Scientifical Men in the whole World. This, I must confess, would be (tho' Shameful to them, yet) of vast Advantage to himself; for, then he need not stand Solving my Demonstrations, for, in that Case, they would be solv'd to his hand; or rather, they were never *Ty'd, Knit, or Connected*. And, it would be a Second Advantage to him, that, in that happy Case, his Fancy might ramble at random, without any Control, or without being fetter'd and shackl'd by this cruel Tyrant *Connexion*, and by the severe Laws of *Logick*; which improve, and, by virtue of *First Principles*, shew this *Connexion* to be really such, and reducible to *Self-Evidence*. By which we see the Reason why his Friend *Merry-man* and himself are so uneasy, and Piqu'd at my *METHOD* to Science, which advances and builds all along upon this Enemy to all these *Cartesian Methods*, this most abominable Proud and Arrogant Usurper over his *Ideas*, *CONNEXION*.

79. It were endless to reckon up all his *Learned Follies* of this kind. My Notes, which gather all his Performances into several Heads, reckon them to be about *two and forty*: All which spring from his Abhorrence of *Connexion*; which neither permits him (or rather, render it Impossible for him) to bring any Arguments of his own, or to Answer mine. Whereas, I am so *Arrogant*, and *Proud*, that I am *over* heartily contented, unless I see *Self-evident Connexion* of the Terms in my *Principles*, and the Terms of my Conclusion to be *Connected*, because the Two Extremes are clearly Connected with the *Middle Term*, or *Medium*, in the Premisses. And, now we see too what is the Reason why he does still *slide* over the *Premisses*, and never looks my Argument *in the Face*, but comes cowardly *behind* it; and first *denies*, and then (after his fashion, or by some of his awkward Methods) sets upon their Rear, my *Conclusions*.

80. After his *Learned Follies*, march, in a long Row, his Plain *Fooleries*: Tho' Those may not seem worthy to be rank'd among his *New Methods*, yet we are mistaken; for, they serve to *set off* the others, and to *stop Gaps* when his Reason is at a *Loss*: And, first, come his Profound Criticisms. For example, p. 68. he takes much pains to tell us what *αδυσάτον*, or Im-

possible, means; and spends above a whole Page in declaring at large no less than Four several Senses, in which *Lawyers* take that Word. As if *Philosophers* could not understand the Meaning of the Words themselves Use, without having recourse to *Lawyers*. However, this helps to shew he is an *Universal Scholar*, and informs the Reader, he has peep'd into *Law-Books* too; at least, into their *Indexes*; and, that he has glean'd thence some few Notes, to enrich his *Common-place-book*; to do which, he thinks a high Point of Knowledge. Which puts me in mind of the Saying of a certain Poet, concerning such Collectors:

—Lord! how they'd look,  
Should they but chance to lose their Table-  
book!

81. The next shall be that of *sentire*; and of *Hearing* also, both in *primo gradu*, and *secundo gradu*: The Summ of which is, that the Word is *Equivocal*; which is no wonder, most Words being such: By which Method, he might make Reflections on ten Parts of twelve of the whole Dictionary. Now, in our Way of Doctrine, how easily are all these Speeches reconcil'd? For, Man being *One Thing*, all his Operations are *Corporeo-Spiritual*; whence,

whence, our Direct Knowledge of Things coming in by our Senses, it is natural to say when we *hear*, that we *know*; since both are done at the same time, and by the same Compound Operation. Thus, when we *see* a thing, we say, we *know* it; all Mankind, till *Cartesius's* Time, holding firmly, that we ought to trust our *Eye-sight*, and the other Senses, when the Power is not disabl'd from perceiving, and the Object and the Medium are well propos'd, convenient, and well circumstanc'd. He has a worse Criticism upon the Word [*Conceptus*,] *Conception*; and this, for two Reasons; One, because we rather *Apprehend*, than *Comprehend*; as if we did not hold our Conceptions to be *Inadequate*; and, by doing so, declare, that we do never, by any one Conception, comprehend the whole Thing. The other Reason is, because a *Conception in the Womb is, Touch'd and Comprehended by it*: Whence, he says, *Visio* suits better with our Knowing a Thing, than *Conceptio*. I wish he would reflect on that Known Maxim, that the Common Use of Words gives them their Signification, whatever their *Radix*, or *Derivation*, Grammatically imports; and, that to be *Conceiv'd* by our Understanding, is the same as to be *seen* by it: So that *Visio* and *Conceptio* fall into the self-same Notion. What a Coil does he keep with

# 154 Raillery Defeated

his Incoherent Criticism upon *Lepidum* and *Lepor*. Now, it signifies, Elegancy of Speech; then, Liberal Arts; then, Trifling and Ridiculous Sports; then, Scurility. Then he wonders I do not take it for *Lepus*, a *Hare*, and make the second Syllable *scort*. And, why so? That he might bring in his Jest of *corripuit Fluvium*, objected to an old Poet, when he us'd the Word *Euphrates* so. Certainly, this bewrays such an Emptiness of Sense, and such a Nitty Pedantick Levity, that it is below Ridiculousness. But, what is all this to me? What is all this to Philosophy? Lastly, What is all this to the Duty incumbent on him, and owing to his Readers, who desire to see Truth? Does he think it becomes him to trifle away his Time, in running thus a *Wooll-gathering* after petty School-Boy Criticisms, and hunting after Butter-flies; and let so many Demonstrations, which, if not *solv'd*, overthrow all *Cartesianism* from the very *Foundation*, lie *Unanswer'd*, and *Untouch'd*?

82. The last Criticism of which (omitting others) I shall take notice, is found in his *Censura*, p. 130. which is such a famous one, that it deserves to be a Pattern to all future Generations, and to entitle him *King of Criticks*. I had us'd the Word [*Directus*,] as a Particle of the Verb [*Dirigo*,] in the plain obvious Sense for [*Directed*,]



rected; ] as we use it, when we say, We direct our Prayers to GOD, or a Letter to a Friend: But, Mr. Le Grand, who is so little acquainted with any kind of Principles, that he reflects not that the First Principle, that governs the Sense and Meaning of all Words, is the Common and Obvious Use of them, which stamps the Signification of them, and makes it Current and Proper, finds strange Mysteries in this ordinary Word; and, as he formerly fear'd a silly Asterisk, or Star, left casually in the Context, was a Plot of mine, to run him thorow with those five Darts; so, now he apprehends I have some Stratagem upon him, for taking [Directus] in that plain Sense: Whereupon, he tells the Reader here, that I am Vir subdolus, a Crafty, or Subtile Man; and have some pernicious Meaning; but, let him alone, he will, in the end, turn it upon my self. Now comes his most Noble Criticism: First, he brings in the Phrase of Plautus, the Comedian; Abi directe; Go your Ways, straight. Thence, he carries it on still farther, I know not how, to [Directe]; which Adverb comes not from Dirigo, but from an odd Obsolete Word, [Directus.] which his Brother-Criticks will tell him, comes from sub Directus; that is, set up in the open Air, or Gibbered. Where are we now? for, we are quite got out of the Signification of the Word

[Dir-



[*Directus*,] which signifies [*Directed*.] But our Critick is not got half way to his Journey's end: For, from [*Directus*,] he carries it on to the Adverb [*Directa*;] which signifies, in English, [*With a Mischief*:] And, [*Ita directa*,] is an old Expression for [*Go, and be hang'd*.] Having brought it to *Directus*, the next thing he does, is, to bring *Directus*, by the Alteration of a Letter, and putting in Another, to [*Diarrectus*:] whereas, no such Word is to be heard of in our Common Dictionaries, nor in the *Lexicon Latino-Barbarum*: Yet, he had a Learned End in it, we may be sure; and, 'tis this; He remember'd there was a Greek Word [*Διρρumpns*,] which signifies [*Disruptus*;] that is, *Burst*, or *Broken asunder*; and, this bringing it to [*Diarrectus*,] gives him Occasion to take a Leap from *Italy*, into *Greece*, that he might make the Word [*Directed*,] signifie [*Broken in pieces*,] as *Διρρumpns* does. Yet, this comes not fully home to his purpose; and, therefore, he makes [*Directus*,] I know not how, to signifie, amongst Criticks, (he means himself,) [*Disrumpi dignus*, *Worthy to be broken in pieces*.] And, now the whole Plot is come to Light: For, when once he had, by *ofsen* scruing the Word, and *shifting* the Signification of it, from one Country, to another, got the plain Word, [*Directus*,] whither

whither he would have it; that is, to signify, [*Worthy to be broken in pieces*]; immediately he applies his Formidable Engine he had been preparing, and down goes my Preface, and my Epilogue, Directed to such and such; they, all of them, deserve to be broken, or torn in pieces. Then he brings [*Broken in pieces*], to Perishing; and, then, my poor self (he says) perishes with them too; and, lastly, by virtue of a Greek Poet's saying, [*If I do perish, let the Earth and Fire be mingl'd*]; Let (says he) [*Universus Terrarum Orbis*], the whole World perish too. Who could have imagin'd that such a Dile and Universal Catastrophe should befall the Whole World, from my using the Word *Directus*, when I expressed my self to *design, send, intend* or *dedicate* my Books, or any piece of them, to such and such Persons. Gentlemen; What can any sober Men think of such a kind of Writer? This is neither Levity, Folly, or Childishness; but, plain Downright Madness: This is something beyond Prince Butler himself. If any one can think this Censure too harsh, let him but parallel such a Distracted Way of Writing in any other Author extant, who is well in his Wits, and, I promise him, I will re-call my Censure. For my part, I can liken such a Rambling Career of Criticism, to nothing but that of a merry Sophister in Cambridge-Schools, who,

who, jokingly (as the Fashion was then, at some certain times,) would needs prove his Adversary, whose Name was Cooper, to have been Lineally Descended from King Pepin, by the like Gradation of Criticisms; alledging, that he was call'd [Cooper, quasi Hooper; Hooper, quasi Haper; Haper, quasi Naper; Naper, quasi Diaper; Diaper, quasi Napkin; Napkin, quasi Pipkin; Pipkin, quasi King Pepin. This, I say, is its only Parallel; only, this Youth did not ramble from one Language to another; nor did this, but only when Mirth and Wit were expected: But, that a Grave Man (as he would be thought) should, in a Treatise where Philosophy and Solidity were expected, let so many pretended Demonstrations lie at his Door, demanding, and calling out to him for an Answer; and spend a considerable part of his Reply so unseasonably, in such Fooleries; and, which is worse, (as appears by his Carriage,) think himself very Learned in Criticism all the while, (which shews he does it seriously,) makes him not reachable by that Sophister, or by any; but, to be a Phoenix, and only Self parallel'd. By this worthy Criticism, the Reader will easily see what a rare Interpreter of Scripture this Man would make, with his Acute Art of Criticizing, which can wire-draw quidlibet à quodlibet.

§4. So far concerning his *Criticisms*: His other Fooleries, which, I believe, take up the fourth part of his Book, are Innumerable: The best of them are so ridiculous, that it is a kind of Foolery in me to take notice of them. However, since I am to lay open all the *New Cartesian Methods*, I am oblig'd to give my Reader some few Instances of them, by which he may guess at the rest. A Friend of his told him, a *Terrible Answer* was coming out against him: This slight Occasion serves him for an Ironical Expression all over his Book; and, *Terribilis Author, Terribile Responsum, Terribiles Falsificationes, Terribile Argumentum*, comes over and over, I believe, at least, a hundred times, in his *Censura*: Which I can liken to nothing so well as to some little, apish, wanton School-boy, blowing a Feather up and down in the Air, to make himself Sport. Yet, this does him more Service than all his Answers. But, give me leave to tell him, that the Way of shewing it *not Terrible*, is, boldly to come close up to my Demonstrations, and solve them: But, he is so far from shewing any such *honest Courage*, that whoever reflects how he *avoids* them all, or *over-leaps* them, will see, that, tho' my *Idea Cartesiana* was not so terrible as to fright him quite out of his Wits, yet, it has put him quite *beside* them; and, has made him.

him skip aside into twenty *Bogs* and *Quagmires*, and *Hiding-places*, to escape meeting with them. Should a Gentleman, *Challeng'd* to the Field, instead of *Meeting* and *Grappling* with his Adversary, run about, into all Companies, flouting at him for a *Terrible Fighter*, a *Terrible Hector*, a *Terrible Swash-buckler*; I fear, every Man would conclude, he was really, and indeed, *Terrible* to him, however he call'd him so in *Mockery*; and, that this *Flouting* him, without giving him the Satisfaction *due*, and *expected*, would scarce serve his Honour, or save him from the Imputation of a Coward. Then, every Error in the Printing is charg'd upon me, as if I knew not how to write true Latin. Upon which, I am told, I *break Priscian's Head*, am an *Ignoramus*, and many such Civil Compliments. Did I think such Toys worth noting, I could requite him with enow of such Observations, in his late *Scabrous*, and (in some places) *Unintelligible Piece*. Then comes in *Horace*, to prove all my Writings are but *Ridiculous Mice*. Then, *Arctotrogus*, an Idle Fellow in *Plautus*, the Merry Comedian, is cited, to prove me *Perjur'd*; [*Perjurio rem hoc homine, &c.* If ever any one saw a more perjur'd Man than this, or more full of *Vanity*, let him take me to him, and I will be his Bond-slave if ever I eat a *Sallad* with him, tho' I were like to starve.]

And,

And, to clinch this Undeniable Testimony that I am *perjur'd*; and, lest the Reader should not believe it was *Artotrogus*, who thus testify'd this Unchristian Immorality of mine, he assures him of it, by telling him, [*Sunt IPSISSIMA Artotrogi verba apud Plautum*.] They are the *VERY* and *EXPRESS* Words of *Artotrogus*, in *Plautus*. What an *Emphatical* Word is that same [*IPSISSIMA*;] and, how *Necessary* to be particularly remark'd! Then comes in *Canis Æsopicus*, the *Dog* in *Æsop*, and admonishes him, by his Example, not to follow my *Shadow*: And, he is so heartily ready to follow the Example *Æsop's* Dog had set him, that he not only not catches at my *Shadow*, but he lets pass what is most *Substantial* too, by not replying to any of my Demonstrations. Then, he talks of a *Cor Gyralis*, a *Whirling Whet-stone*, to put to my *Nose*: Which is a *Mystical* Jeer, taken from some of his *Pedantick* Observations. Then comes in *Miles Gloriosus*, and his *Machæra quæ gestit fartum facere ex hostibus*; his *Sword*, that longs to make a *Pudding* of his *Enemy*: I beseech the Reader to view the 2d and 3d Pages, and then tell me, if ever he read a Man more vainly proud of big Words, than this *Empty* Man is. After that, he brings in his Friend's *Pyrgopolynices in campis Gurgustidoni ubi Bombomachides Cluninstaridysarchides erat Imperator summus*,



*mus, Nptuni filius.* What Stuff is this? Can this Man do himself a greater Disparagement, than to tell his Reader how fond he is of such Trash? Yet, to talk idly when he has *nothing else to do*, is more excusable for an *Aery*, Light-headed Man; but, to talk at this rate, when he has such serious Business lies upon his Hands, as Vindicating his *Cartesian* Doctrine from so many Arguments; and, then, instead of Answering *any one* of them, to stand Cutting Capers in the Air, and Vapouring with such High-sounding Bombast, tells every Man he is at a scurvy Loss; and, too plainly detects, how Insignificant he is in any thing belonging to *Sense* and *Solidity*.

84. Yet, upon Second Thoughts, however Mr. *Le Grand* makes me a *Liar*, and *Perjur'd*; yet, I will be so civil to him, as to declare he has not, for any thing I can say, told *one single Lye* in any of his Books; perhaps, never since he follow'd *Cartesius's* Doctrine; no, nor *Falsify'd* neither. To understand which thorowly, and, that the Reader may see I neither flatter him, nor injure my self, upon whom he has laid so many false Aspersions; I am to give him Information of one main Point of *Cartesius's* Doctrine; which is, That (no Credit being to be given to our Senses, but only to the *Ideas* which the Soul frames in  
her



her self) our Judgment is not therefore *True*, because 'tis conformable to the *Things* without us; but, the *Things* are then to be judg'd *True*, or to be really *thus* or *thus*, when they are conformable to our *Ideas*: Whereas, the *Aristotelians* say, That we then judge *True*, when the *Things* are such as we judge them to be; and, that our Senses, except in some odd Circumstances, do not deceive us. Wherefore, since to *Lye*, is not barely to say a *Falshood*; for, a Man may do so very innocently, and yet, since he spoke to the best of his Judgment, be an Innocent and Good Man: but, to *Lye*, is to go against his own Thoughts, or Judgment: This being so, hence Mr. Le Grand may think, and say, (as he does in his Preface to his Reader,) that I spoke *false* when I objected that he had said I was in *DEUM impius*, *Impious against GOD*; for, his *Ideas* might inform him so: Whereas, I, neglecting his Way of *Ideas*, and relying on this *Fallacious Sense* of mine, *Eye-sight*, seem'd to read those Words very plain in his former Preface, p. 28. l. 4. Thus he might read in my Books, by the Light of his *Ideas*, that I deny'd GOD was *Primaria Causa*, or the *First Cause of Motion*; whereas, I believing these false Senses of mine do find that I only deny'd he is the *Immediate Cause* of it; and, that he must therefore be the *Primary*

mary Cause, because he moves Matter by Second Causes, the *Angels*. Thus my Ears informing my Common Reason, of the Language amongst Charitable and Good People, told me, that to call one *Asinus ad Lyram, Talpa Cæcior, Blasphemus, delirus, facie non satis honesta*; and, that I spit at Heaven, and twenty such like Contumelies, were *Virulent Expressions*; notwithstanding which, his *Ideas* might, for all that, tell him that they were (as he calls them here) *Modest*. So, my Eyes inform me, that I only put *two Propositions* in that place lately cited, and said expressly, *No Determinate Conclusion could follow, out of them, from the Disposal of the Terms in a Syllogism*: But, his *Ideas* might tell him, I put *three Propositions* in both places, and, that there are no such Words as those now mention'd, which directly told him the true State of the Question; and, that therefore he had no reason to take notice of them. Lastly, By the same means it may come about, that his *Ideas* might tell him that I had said those very Words, [*Providentia Divina me, ex Aliis omnibus, selegit.*] And, the like may be said of all the other Falsifications I had Charg'd on him, and Multitudes of others, which (proceeding only by *Instances*) I had omitted; whereas, these *False and Fallacious Eyes* of mine told me, there were no such Words.

Words in the places he cited for them, but quite *contrary*. So that, he and I might both of us mean to speak *Truth*; but, either *my Senses*, or *his Ideas*, might *delude*, and *deceive* us: Which we ought to believe, is left to the Reader's Judgment to determine. Besides, perhaps, he might think, as is *Malbranche's* Method, (whom he so zealously defends,) that he saw all these things I object, in the *Ideas* which he sees in *GOD*, or fancies that he has a *Divine Revelation* of it; and therefore, it had been *Impious* against *GOD*, not to believe, and do, as he did. Whence results this Corollary, That 'tis hard to fix any Ill Intention upon any High-flown, Seraphick *Cartesian*, lest we judge rashly of what he thinks he is assur'd of by Divine Inspiration.

85. But, leaving him to make out the Certainty of his *Ideas*, and passing over his most Useful New Method of *Saying any thing*, tho' never so *Extravagant*, and *Incredible*, provided it but tends to *Disgrace* or *Fear* his Adversary; now comes their Last Method of Arguing and Answering, which flies a higher pitch, and aims at Blemishing all my Endeavours, by an Objection, which, tho' it be an *Extrinfecal* one, and taken from the Authority of Learned Men, of great Repute, (as the *Sorbonists* are;) yet, he is well aware it will do greater Execution,

Execution, than any *Intrinsic* Arguments they can hope to bring against me. Their Design (as their Managery of this Contest shews) is not to instruct the Reader, or *Confute* me; but, meerly to *Despise*, and *Disgrace* me: And, a Censure of my Doctrine by the *Sorbon-Doctors*, especially, back'd with *Authority* of the Chief Ecclesiastical Governors in that place, will, (as they hope) lay such a Load upon a Single Man's Credit, that it must necessarily *sink* under it. And, tho' the pretended Censure were in a Matter quite different from that of *Cartesianism*, (which was at first, and still ought to have been, the only Question,) and therefore, is nothing at all to the *Right* purpose; it is, for all that, very much to *their* purpose; which is, to defame me; which blessed Project achiev'd, they hope, by this Means, to raise such a Hubbub, and Noise, that the *Quiet* Force of my *Intrinsic* Arguments will never be heard, or regarded; but, put to *Silence*, and *Shame*, by their *Clamorous Out-cry*. Besides; They judg'd, nothing could make their Calumny more *Authentic*, than to relate it confidently, as *Plain Matter of Fact*; and, to represent it as such a Matter of Fact, as already *transit in rem judicatum*: Nor are they much concern'd whether it be *True*, or *False*; that is Indifferent to such Resolute Men; so long as it serves

serves a turn to beat down my Credit, all is as well as may be. He tells the Reader then, pag. 7. that I did *audacter asserere tam Fidem quam Scientiam non nisi per hoc Principium, (viz. Terminorum Connexionem,) acquiri posse.* Also, (*ibid.*) *Authoritate publicâ duas Propositiones, (which he names there,) anathematizare adactus est, necnon subscribere Censuræ dicenti; Illas in sensu Catholico non posse explicari; that is, that I boldly affirm'd, that neither Faith nor Science could be attain'd, but by this Principle, viz. Seeing the Connexion of the Terms, or seeing Faith, or, at least, the Way to it, Demonstrated: The First of which excludes All; the Later, Almost all the Christians in the World, from the Means to Salvation.* Also, That I was forc'd, by Publick Authority, to Anathematize two Propositions of mine; and also, to subscribe to the Censure, That they could not be explicated in a Catholick Sense. The Sum of which is, that the Sorbon-Doctors Censur'd some Doctrines of mine; and Publick Authority forced me to retract, or (as his hot Phrase runs) to Anathematize them, and subscribe to the Censure that said, they could not be explicated in a Catholick Sense. And, pag. 8. he adds farther, That it is Printed, or Recorded, for Eternity, by an Egregious Author, in a *Verissima Historia*; (meaning *Lominus* his Libel:) And, Lastly, That this puts me

me into a Panick Fear of the *Roman Inquisition*. And, hence, he tells his Reader, p. 11. that I am *abundè satis notus*; he means, *abominably well known*, both in France, Germany, Italy, nay, to the Pope himself; which, if not True, is a Lye as large as all England, Scotland, France and Ireland. What will become of poor me! Or, where shall I hide my Head! I am, it seems, like Old Cain, *Vagus & Profugus in terrâ*: Mr. Le Grand has, for my Sins against *Cartesius*, Excommunicated me, and all-to-be Heretick'd me, here in England: And, his *Lashing Friend* (according to his Obliging Temper) says, my Book against the *Cartesians* deserves to be burnt by the Hand of the Hang-man. So that here is no staying for me here, after such a Disgrace: And, it will be hard to find any other Country, where I can hope for Shelter; or, where my *Crying Sins* will not pursue, and proclaim me. And, which is worse, should I be put to death, or burnt, as such a complicated Lump of all Heresies deserves, I must never hope for the Honour of a Christian Burial: And, what a lamentable Case am I in then?

86. But, to be serious: If what Mr. Le Grand says, in this Long-winded Calumny, be True, I am *Eternally Disgrac'd*: But, if I manifest, by Undeniable Testimony, that all this Rabble of *Matters of*

Fact



Fact he charges upon me be an *Arrant Fals-*  
*hood, and Calumny*; and, that I make it  
 appear, that not *the title of my Doctrine*  
 was ever Condemn'd by any *Sorbon Do-*  
*ctor*; and, that I *never retracted* one *title*  
 of it, nor was *forc'd* by *Publick Authority*  
 to do so, much less to *Anathematize it*.  
 Also, if I prove here, that I never held,  
 nor said, (what he here, in express Terms,  
 imposes upon me, *viz. [Tam Fidem quam*  
*Scientiam non nisi per Terminorum Connexio-*  
*nem acquiri posse*;) but ever held the *con-*  
*trary Doctrine*, both as to that Proposi-  
 tion, as also to the *Ill Sense* put by Tricks  
 upon some Words taken out of my Books,  
 which *Ill and Falsly impos'd Sense* was the  
 only Sense that was Condemn'd; then  
 Mr. Le Grand must consult with his own  
 Conscience, whether he has not incurr'd  
 the Penalty of *Excommunication*, for *Pub-*  
*lishing* in Print such *notoriously False Slan-*  
*ders* against his Fellow-Christian; or, by  
 what Case he will excuse, or how he  
 will acquit himself, when it comes to be  
 prov'd upon him, that by his thus Ca-  
 lumniating his Neighbour so *grievously,*  
*falsly and openly*, he has render'd himself  
 thus Criminal, and Obnoxious: Especial-  
 ly, when the Circumstances that highly ag-  
 gravate this Crime of his, shall come to  
 be charg'd upon him.



87. To understand more fully how this Business pass'd, we are to premise, that nothing is easier than to extract Words out of any Book, writ by a Christian; and then disguising them, (by concealing the Scope and Tendency of the whole Book, the State of the Question, and the Immediate Antecedents and Consequents in those very places,) to make those Words, thus Extracted, and Exhibited, to speak perfect Heresie, or worse. Take an Example: If, out of that Verse in the Psalmist, [*The Fool hath said in his Heart, There is no GOD,*] any one should extract those Words, [*There is no GOD,*] and propose them in a Paper, thus sing'd out, to any Learned Man, for his Judgment, not telling him they were found in a Book, where the Concomitant Words, or the Circumstances, might, perhaps, give them quite another Sense; but, that it was in *Theses*, where every single Proposition stands alone, unassisted by its Fellows, as to the declaring its Sense: Would any Christian, thus surpriz'd, stick to declare, that such a Proposition was flat *Atheism*, and could not be explicated in a Christian Sense? This was my very Case. A certain Great Ecclesiastick, who was of good Parts, but (as we are not all of us of the same Temper) of a High Spirit, Turbulent, (for which Reason, 'tis thought, he had been dismiss'd  
out

out of his Order,) and, withall, a Great Pretender to *Policy*, hapt to be at *Paris*, when I was also there. He pretended great Friendship to me, and extoll'd my Books highly; (as another Gentleman, now my greatest Adversary, has also done formerly,) and this in Print. But, it unfortunately happen'd, that a certain Great Person, on whose Esteem he had set a high Value, did, very imprudently, to his Face, prefer my Writings before his; with some Underserv'd Aggravations of the One, and Reflexions on the Other. This, tho' without my being Accessary, in the least, to that Affront, quite Alienated his Friendship from me; and, he would needs make all those Books of mine, tho' of late so highly prais'd by himself, to be *Heretical*. At which time, some certain Gentlemen, who love to *fish in Troubl'd Waters*, and were not over-friendly to me, (one of whom, as I am told, had a Hand in Penning *Merry-man's Libel*;) struck in with him; knowing, that a more fitting Instrument to make Bustles could hardly be found. To carry on this Project then, Three Propositions were pick'd out of my Books; and so politickly contriv'd, that, partly by *stifling* the Knowledge that they were in any Book at all, partly by *Adding* to, and *Altering*, my Words, they plainly signify'd, that *None was to believe*;

unless they saw the Connexion of Terms, or (which is the same) had a *Demonstration*, or *Science*, of the *Mysteries* of Faith themselves: And, in *this Sense*, two *Sorbon* Doctors, thus cheated, condemn'd them; as my self, had I been thus over-reach'd, should have done; that Sense being both manifestly Heretical, and point-blank contrary to my constantly avow'd Doctrine; as I shew'd manifestly, out of many signal and most expresse places, cited in my *Vindicie*. This Censure being, by Stratagem, obtain'd, he flew about the Town, shewing the Censure, and amplifying mightily upon my Imaginary Heresies: But, no Solicitation could obtain of him a Copy of the Censure it self; lest it might come to my hands, and so enable me to defend my self, and detect the *Falsity*; so, being incapacitated to say any thing in my own Vindication, I never troubl'd my self at that which I could not help. About ten Days after, during which time his Envy took its full Swing, the two very Reverend Persons, Dr. Godden, and Mr. Barklay, Principal, or President, of the *Scotch* College, came to my Chamber, and thus, with some Resentment, accosted me: Sir, *What do you mean? Are you stupid, that you sit studying here, Unconcern'd, when you are proclaim'd a Heresick all over the Town?* I reply'd, *When I can get the Censure, and know what*

what is Objected, I am sure I can defend my self: In the mean time, 'tis Defence enough to let People know I cannot obtain the Equity of him to know my Fault. They reply'd, Tho' you dis-regard your Credit, we, that are known to be your Friends, resolve to be more careful of ours. So Mr. Barklay, taking Monsieur St. Amour, a Sorbon Doctor, with him, to make his Quality known, went to the Chamber of Monsieur de S. Beuve, the Chief of the Censurers, and thus accosted him; Sir, you have condemn'd Three Propositions in the Books of Mr. S. which may make as great Stirs in England, as the First Propositions have done in France. He, all amaz'd, reply'd, That he had Censur'd no Proposition in any Book, nor could in Prudence, or Honesty, unless he had perus'd the Book it self; to be satisfy'd, by comparing it with the Scope of the Discourse, and the adjoining Words, what Sense it must clearly and necessarily have. In the Nick comes in my Adversary, with the Censure in his Pocket: Well met, Mr. Barklay, says he; now your great Friend, Mr. S. is condemn'd of Heresie, by this Learned Man. My Lord, replies Mr. de St. Beuve, I neither Censur'd his Person, nor any Proposition of his, unless he maintain'd those Propositions thus singl'd out, and exhibited, as you propos'd them in your Paper. Then Mr. Barklay begg'd he might have a Sight of the Censure; which was

something unwillingly granted; yet, it  
 could not be deny'd in such a Presence.  
 Having perus'd it; Now, my Lord, says  
 Mr. Barclay, to let you see, I am neither a  
 Heretick, nor a Favourer of them, I will sub-  
 scribe this Censure: More than that, I dare  
 swear, Mr. S. will, at first sight, subscribe it  
 too: For, the Sense here condemn'd, is quite  
 Different from the whole Scope of his Books;  
 which treat only of Demonstrating *Prævia ad*  
*Fidem*, and not at all of Demonstrating the  
 Mysteries, or Points of Faith; nay, it's di-  
 rectly Opposite to his Doctrine, to say, they  
 can be Demonstrated. At these Words,  
 Monsieur de St. Beuve grew warmer with  
 him; telling him roundly, *Domine, calli-*  
*di & artificiosi mecum egisti, adeo in suspicer*  
*arum hoc ex livore profectum*: You have dealt  
 craftily with me, and with Artifices; so that  
 I suspect that all this Business springs from  
 Rigue. Mr. Barclay assipulated, and told  
 him, *Domine, rem acu tetigisti*: Sir, you are  
 in the very right on't. Whereupon, my  
 Adversary rising up in a great Heat, with  
 a Face engrain'd in Anger, thunder'd out;  
*Mentiris, Barclaie; mentiris impudentissime.*  
*Ego novi quis sis; nempe, Hæreticus ipse, &*  
*Fautor Hæreticorum: Ego tibi has vices re-*  
*pendam.* You lye, Barclay; you lye most im-  
 pudently. I know what you are; that is, a  
 Heretick, and a Favourer of Hereticks: But,  
 I shall be even with you. The grave Sorbon  
 Doctors

Doctors were astonish'd at this furious Transport; but, Mr. Barclay being a Man of great Prudence, and never in Passion; Nay, my Lord, says he, *I do not love to hear my self abus'd.* So he takes a short Leave, and brings away the *Original* of the *Censure* with him; while the other, being in a high Passion, had forgot to re-demand it: Yet, he lingerd, unseen, not far off, till he saw my Adversary gone by; and return'd to the Doctor, and told him, he had got the *Original* of the *Censure*; desiring him to go to the Archbishop of *Bavaria* from me, and request of him, that I might keep the *Censure*, and write my *Vindicta*. He was heartily glad it was got from him, promising to go thither immediately, and to do me all the Right I could desire; and assuring him, the *Censure* should never come into his hands again. So my Request was granted, and I set to write my *Vindicta*. In the meantime, we sent divers to my Adversary; desiring to see the *Censure*; telling him, they would not believe such a sinister Report concerning me, unless they saw it with their own Eyes. Which put him (loath to say, his Passion had made him lose it) to a great Nonplus how to answer, and gave us much Divertisement. He apply'd to the Archbishop, and complain'd to him, that Mr. Barclay had stole the *Censure* from him.



But his Answer was, That he had order'd I should have it, to make my Defence. Which mortify'd him exceedingly.

88. My *Vindiciae*, which were now finish'd, being in Latin, and my Books in English, eight Divines of the greatest Quality and Worth, (who understood English,) were deputed to examine the Sincerity of my *Vindiciae*; and all of them, except one, admitted by my Adversary himself; viz. Mr. Thomas Godden, Doctor of Divinity, Ex-President of *Lisbo-College*, Preacher to Her Majesty, and Treasurer of her Chapel: Mr. Francis Gage, Doctor of the Faculty of *Paris*, afterwards President of the College of *Doway*: Mr. Robert Barclay, Principal, or President, of the *Scotch College* at *Paris*: Mr. John Betham, and Mr. Bonaventure Gifford, then Bachelors of Divinity in the *Sorbon*; afterwards, *Parisian* Doctors; and the latter of them now Bishop of *Madaura*: Mr. Edward Cary, and Mr. George Kempe, Canons: And Mr. Edward Lutton, Confessor to the *English* Religious: Who did, first, each of them apart; afterwards, met in a Body, or Conference, give their Unanimous Attestation, subscrib'd by their Names, in these Words, viz. First, That *All the places*, out of my Books, alledg'd by me, were faithfully turn'd into Latin. Secondly, That From the whole Context and Scope of the Author,

in



in those places brought by him, to prove that he does not maintain the Sense condemn'd, is manifest, that he does not require Knowledge of the Mysteries, in themselves, by Evident Reason; but, professedly maintains, that they are Incomprehensible, and above the reach of Humane Reason. Thirdly, That the Sense assign'd by him, to the three abovesaid Propositions, is Conformable to the Scope and Tenour of his Discourse in those very places whence they are extracted; and therefore, we judge this to be his True and Genuine Sense. Also, we cannot but confess, that those Omissions, and Additions, which were the Reasons why the Propositions seem'd to bear another Sense, were justly charg'd by him.] After this, my Adversary would needs give them some Objections, (which, we may be sure, were the best he could make,) by way of Instruction to their Second Thoughts, how they might make a right Judgment of my Doctrine. They met all again, consider'd them maturely, and made a Second Subscription, That they found nothing in them, which could, in the least, make them judge otherwise than they did witness formerly. This done, the Archbishop of Paris told me, that if I would subscribe to the Censure, he would order the Censurers to make me Satisfaction under their Hands, by declaring, no part of my Doctrine was Censur'd; alledging, that, as they were  
15 ready

ready to clear my Credit, so it was but fitting I should clear them; and acknowledge, those Propositions, as they were exhibited to them, were justly *Condemnable*; as may be seen in my *Glyceus Septemplex*, pag. 96. I, at first, begg'd his Pardon; alledging, that my Adversary was of that Humour, that he would thence take Occasion to Vapour, he had made me Retract. *Subscribe then*, says he, *in what Form you will*. Hereupon, I gave in my Subscription, in these very Words; *Non Doctrinam meam Retractans; sed in eadem, utpote à Censurâ immuni, atque ab Illusterrimo Olivero Plunketto totius Hiberniæ Primatæ, atque à Superioribus meâ approbatâ, Persistens, contrarietumque ubicunque repertum fuerit condemnans*. This done, the Censurers were commanded to make me Satisfaction under their Hands; which they did, in a Formal Instrument, declaring, That they did not, *vel minimam notam inungere, blemish with the least Note, or Censure, either me, or my Books*: Adding, That If any should pretend it, they did, from their Hearts, profess, that they made a sinister Interpretation of their Censure. And, there was an End of that Politick Jigg; the Issue of which was very Honourable to me, and most Shameful to my Enemies...

89. By this Relation, every Title of which I can justify by sufficient Testimony, and Authentick Records, which I have now in my hands; as also, by my *Vindicie*, and *Clypeus Septemplex*, publish'd immediately after the Contest, where all these Particulars, (and many others,) to my farther Clearing, are printed; which I durst not have publish'd, unless they had been True to a tittle, before the Face of all those Honourable and Learned Persons yet alive, who would have hated me for printing Falshoods of them; and my Chief Adversary himself, and his Complices, yet living, who would have desir'd no more, but to have found me tripping in the least part of my Narrative. These Things, I say, being so, Judge, I beseech you, Gentlemen, what a prodigious Folly, as well as Malice, it is in Mr. Le Grand, and his Libeller, to pretend that any one tittle of my Doctrine was Condemn'd by Sorbon Doctors; that I was cited before any Tribunal; that I was forc'd to Anathematize any part of my Doctrine, and subscribe to the Censure of it, &c. Whereas, it is manifestly attested, I only subscrib'd to my own ever-avow'd Doctrine. Nor was I forc'd. No Tribunal need'd with me, or concern'd themselves about me; and, if I would have wro'd my own Satisfaction from the Censurers, none ob-

lig'd

lig'd me to subscribe at all. Lastly, How Base and False a Calumny is it, to say, that by Subscribing, I *Retracted*; when I expressly subscrib'd, as *Not-retracting* my Doctrine; or, that I was forc'd to *Anathematize* it, whenas I subscrib'd it as *Persisting* in it! Nor are any of those Propositions, thus exhibited, and extracted, in reality, mine, (*Nam male dum recitat, incipit esse sua,*) any more than [*Non est Deus,*] thus singl'd out, is the Scriptures: I have no Propositions, but in Books; where many Circumstances are found, determining the *Sense*. And, he that pretends this, may, by the same Reason, accuse the Scripture of Atheism. How rash a Slander, then, is it in Mr. *Le Grand*, to lay these things to my Charge! And, how lying a Fellow is his Libelling Assistant, whose Calumnies are so notorious, and some of them so Criminal, that, were he known, he would be liable to lose his Ears.

90. The next Stratagem of our Politicians, (for, we expected new ones every Day,) was, to pick out of my Books no less than 37 Propositions, (with the same Honesty, we may be sure, as they did the former,) which they carry'd to the then-Nuncio at *Paris*, now Cardinal *Spada*; pretending the same Zeal for Faith, as Mr. *Le Grand* does; and, as those two Idle

Knaves

Knaves did, who are said to have laid their Heads together, to pen this Libel: And therefore, pressing to have them sent to the highest Tribunal, to be Condemn'd with all speed, because my Heresie (forsooth!) spread far and near in *England*, and infected the whole Country. The Nuncio took them; but, being a Man of Wisdom, apply'd to my Lord Abbot *Montague* the next Morning, to know what strange Heresie this was, which, like a Cancer, spread so fast in *England*. Who, smiling, acquainted him at large with the Undeserved Feud of my Adversary, and my Innocency. The Nuncio sends for me the next Day, receiv'd me very kindly; told me, he understood how I was persecuted by some Adversaries of mine, and deliver'd me their *Objections*; desiring me to write an *Answer*, and he would do me the Equity to send up *both together*. Both which are printed in the Second Part of my *Vindicie*. So this Second Plot was defeated; and my Maligners came off as shamefully as they did in the former: For, they could never gain the least Advantage upon me, if they did not surprize Great Men with False Pretences, and prevent my Answering for my self.

91. But, Envy is a *Restless Vice*. Their Third Main Plot, (omitting many petty ones,) was, to print a Libel against me, under

## For Railery Defeated

under the Name of *Lomius*, (which, some say, N. N. and T. W. have Copy'd, and imitated, exactly;) making me guilty of near forty Heresies. But, this Book having neither Author, Printer, nor Approver's Name put to it, (which made it highly punishable by the Laws of the Kingdom, if any did spread it,) it was glad to sneak in hugger-mugger: Which concurring Blemishes so *disgrac'd* it, that none regarded it; For, What Man of Common Sense will believe, that a Writer for Faith, against such a manifold Heretick, should be afraid to own his Name, if his Accusations were not *Calumnies*? Besides, the Writer of it had counterfeited the Subscriptions against me of two *Parisian* Doctors, by name, of Mr. *Peter Nugent*, and Mr. *Thaddæus à Brien*; who, in their Letters to the Cardinal of Norfolk, (Authentick Copies of which I have in my hands,) complain'd of such *Impostures*, and requested *they might not pass Unpunish'd*. So that, from many Heads, it was convicted, and held to be a *plain Libel*. Lastly, I complain'd of it to the *Sacra Congregatio*; laid it open, and confuted it, in my *Querimonia* to Superiour Powers, and my *Anridori*; as it is to be seen in my *Clypeus Septemplex*, and the large Preface to my *Vindicia*. And, so, the Third Plot of my Adversary, and of the Gentlemen behind



hind the Curtain, his Assistants, went out in a Snuff, and left an ill Scent behind it. And, so much for Mr. Le Grand's *Egregius Author*, and *Verissima Historia*, which does *Aeternitati pingere* (as he says) my Errors. Which none regarded, but those who help'd to pen it; with one of whom Mr. Le Grand and his Friend (as I am inform'd) have struck a *Holy League*, to carry on their *Senseless* and *already Baff'd Slanders* and *Calumnies* against me.

92. But, the Fourth Plot was so finely laid, they hop'd it would be prosperous, and make amends for all; and, that, being *so well levell'd*, it could not but *hit the Mark*. They sent up all my Books to Cardinal Barberin; and, with them, one of my Lord Chancellor Hyde's, writ against Mr. Cressy, (the Title of which they had torn out;) pretending to him, they were all writ by one and the same Author, my self. Their Friends there press'd the Condemnation of them with such a hurry, as if the whole Church had totter'd if it were not done quickly. To expedite the Business, they earnestly solicited him, that only that one Book (*viz.* Chancellor Hyde's) should be read; and then, to determin whether all the Books writ by such a pernicious Author, ought not to be condemn'd. The Cardinal, without naming me, delivers them to a worthy Divine, who



who understood English ; bidding him *Keep the rest, till call'd for, and read only this one* ; (pointing to that of the Chancellors, which they had signally particulariz'd to him,) and give him an Account of it as speedily as was possible ; for, by that one, they could judge of the rest. What Remedy now ? Would not any Man swear now that all was Cock-sure ? But, there is no Policy against God's Providence ; which directed thither an *English* Divine, who had lately come out of *England*, and attended the now Earl of *Derwent-water*, and his Brother, in their Travels. He being of Acquaintance with this Divine, came to visit him in the very nick of Opportunity, and finding him very busie in reading that Decretory-Book, went to his Table, and took up some Books that he saw lie there together : Finding, to his Astonishment, they were *mine*, he ask'd him how they came by all Mr. S's Books ? The other told him, he was much mistaken ; and said, they *could not* be *mine* ; telling him, they had a far other Character of me ; whereas, the Book he was reading, which was (said he) writ by the *same* Author ; could not possibly be writ by a Man of Mr. S's Principles. Mr. *Middleford* (for, that was my Friend's Name) knew the Book, and avow'd it was writ by another Author, whom he nam'd to him.

him. At which, the *Roman* Divine held held up his Hands with Admiration, at such a Knavish Contrivance. So, they agreed that Mr. *Midford* should go with him the next Morning, to Cardinal *Barberin*, to inform him what a Cheat was put upon him, to *hasten* him to judge of all my Books, by the Book of another, who was of another Judgment, and went upon different Principles. This was so *Shameful*, and *Horrid*; that, after this, not an Enemy of mine *durst* appear. Besides my *Clypeus Septemplex*, and *Vindicie*, I had sent divers *Apologeticks* thither, explaining my Doctrine; which the *Roman* Divines examining, desir'd Mr. *Midford* to know of me, if my Occasions would let me come thither, to teach the same Doctrine there, I had printed in *England*. If I would, they would petition for a good Pension to maintain me. But, I was a greater Lover of my Studies in my *Privacy*, than I was of *Courts*. However, Mr. *Le Grand*, and my then Opposers, may see by this, how I am *Notus in Gallia*, and in *Italia*. The Malice of my Enemies (as GOD had order'd it) having done me more Kindness, and gain'd me more Honour, than all my Friends could ever have done. All this was writ by Mr. *Midford*, to my Friends, and my self, then at *Paris*; divers of whom are yet alive, to witness it.

63. I am heartily sorry to lay open such Fraudulent and Unconscionable Carriages in any Christians much more in those of my own Persuasion; it being so perfectly contrary to *Common Honesty*, that a *Turk* would blush at it, and a good Moral *Heathen* detest it. But, when my Christian Credit is thus assaulted, I am oblig'd in Conscience to vindicate my self: Nor, can any Man blame me, for doing that Just and Necessary Duty to my own Reputation. Perhaps, to revive this Quarrel, which the Chief Church-Governors have Examined, Determin'd, and Compos'd, Mr. Le Grand exerts himself in this *Censure* of his, to gratifie the Contrivers of it then, hoping it would oblige them to put them in a Capacity to play a *Back-Game*. And, for the same Reason, he gets about to gratifie some Protestants too, by hazarding his Credit, to do them a Kindness. But, as I believe, the former are too prudent to begin Squabbles with one, who meddles not with them; so, I am very confident, the Later have too much Honour and Candour in them, to be offended at a Man who writes for his Conscience; and in such a Cause, as is the Settling Christian Faith upon such Grounds as are *Absolutely Certain*; which is the Interest of all Christians: And, that they will never be favourable to a Writer, that wrongs  
the

the Common Cause, and, consequently, his own Conscience, to please his Passion; much less, to such a Man, who, in his *Censura*, as appears by the Words, [*ut sint*,] calls the Protestants In England, INFIDELS.

94. That the World may know of how different a Temper I was, from that of Mr. Le Grand, (whether *Natural* to him, or *Inspir'd* by another, I wave at present,) after his *Censura Infusissima* came out, notwithstanding his Unoccasion'd Provocations at first, which was the Origin of all this Warmth of Opposition, to little Editing to Sober Christians, or Beneficial to Learned Readers; tho' I saw also, there was a Pound of Gall in that Book, for a Grain of Reason; yet I did charitably resolve to try if I could calm his Passion, and sweeten his Bitter Humour. To compass this, I put my self upon some great Disadvantages; and blam'd my self as much as I could with any Degree of Truth; that so I might invite him, by my Example, to some Civil Acknowledgment of his Peevish Errours, I had resolv'd to pass over all his Unfavourable Taunts, his Railing, Falsifications, and Untrue Imputations, under the Name of Mistakes; nor to take notice of his manifold Ommissions; but to put down barely, and clearly, my yet Unanswer'd Arguments; tho' it was tedious to me, without any Occasion,

to repeat them. Nay, I fully purpos'd to give his Pretended Answers a fairer Character than they could deserve; and, while I rectify'd his Errours, to excuse, as well as I could, what was Amiss, or Defective. I had fram'd my Thoughts to pen my Book in a Gay, Familiar Style, to put him in a good Humour. And, in a Word, I was resolv'd to omit nothing that could become a Kind Friend, and a Charitable Christian. Whence, I had begun my Reply on this manner; by which, the Reader may make an Estimate, how Condescending and Obliging the Whole had been, had they let it go forward.

### VERITAS & PAX.

[“ *R*esponso mollis frangit Iram, Ser-  
mo Durus suscitatur Furorem, in-  
quit Sapiens, (Prov. 15. v. 1.) Hor-  
tatur etiam Propheta, Dei nomine lo-  
quens, (Zach. 8. v. 9.) ut, Veritatem ac  
Pacem diligamus. Utrumque hoc di-  
ctum, Vir Eximie, nobismetipsis appli-  
care debemus; saltem, Ego utrumque  
mihimet applico. Quare iterum ad Te  
redeo, iterum te adior: Non animo  
Insensio, sed verè Amico: non, præ Fa-  
ma meæ tuendæ studio, forsan ultra mo-  
dum effervescens; sed, ad Amicitiam  
Charitatēque. (heu nimis læsas!) re-  
“ dia-

"dintegrandas paratissimus. Perculit me,  
 "fateor, (idque non immerito,) quòd nun-  
 "quam à me *lesus*, sed uti existimabam,  
 "mihi *Amicus*, Cartésianæ tamen Doctrinæ,  
 "quam impugnabam, Zelanrior, &  
 "forſan, ſuaſionibus Aliorum eodem ze-  
 "lo nimis flagrantium, obſequentior, in  
 "Contumelias contra Perſonam ac Fa-  
 "mam meam, effuſius quam par erat, Scri-  
 "pto Publico, proruperis. Venit mihi  
 "in mentem Davidicum illud (*Pſ. 55. 13,*  
 "*14, 15.*) *Si Inimicus meus maledixiſſet*  
 "*mihi, ſuſtinuiſſem utique— Tu verò homo*  
 "*unanimis & notus meus— in domo Dei am-*  
 "*bulaſtimus cum conſenſu, &c.* Hinc, com-  
 "motior factus, ad Deſenſionem me ac-  
 "cinxī. Atque utinam intra juſtæ De-  
 "ſenſionis fines me continuiſſem. Perdiſ-  
 "ficile ſiquidem eſt, ut quiſquam, acerbè,  
 "idque (quantum ſibi conſcius erat) ſine  
 "cauſâ tractatus, modum ubique ſeruet.  
 "Repoſuiſti tu, & altioribus adhuc Con-  
 "vitiis fræna laxaſti. Quid hîc facien-  
 "dum? Num in Jurgiis ac Rixis, ſine ſi-  
 "ne reciprocatis, ac nemini profuturis,  
 "prodigendum Tempus, conſpurcanda  
 "Charta? Ridiculum! Tandem, ſapia-  
 "mus, & redeamus ad cor. Scilicet *Ho-*  
 "*mines* uterque ſumus, originali labe in-  
 "fecti, indèque lapſu faciles, at ſupernâ  
 "(uti ſpero) præmuniti gratiâ, quò minus  
 "malevolentiz venenum in Animæ viſce-  
 "ra



ra se effundat. Nec rideant nos Lecto-  
 res nostri. Eâdem pice inquinati sunt  
 & ipsi, eâdemque farinâ subacti. Et,  
 forsan, pauci sunt, qui hoc idem non  
 facitassent, si in iisdem circumstantiis  
 fuissent constituti, atque easdem cogita-  
 tiones eisdemque affectus habuissent.  
 Solus, idque merito, ridebit nos Humani  
 Generis Hostis (& quos habet sequa-  
 ces;) qui Homines invicem committere,  
 rixas ferere, ac seminatas usque fo-  
 vere gessit. Quin rideamus & nos, vi-  
 ce nostrâ, Incendiarium illum; & delu-  
 sum se sentiat qui foveam aliis struxit.  
 Quicquid crepar Metaphysica de *Primi*  
*Principii* atque *Alrissimi* *Causis*, cer-  
 tē Nos à *Conrioribus* longē Principiis &  
*Causis Alrioribus*, Divina Lege sancitis  
 ac commendatis, edocti sumus Chari-  
 tatem Fraternali Dissertationibus Phi-  
 losophicis, & Magistri (quisquis ille fue-  
 rit) Placitis longē anteferebam. Ho-  
 mines, inquam, sumus; indēque nonni-  
 hil *Humani* passi; At videant omnes, no-  
 tales nihilominus esse Homines, qui nō  
 runt corrigere in sese quodcunque de-  
 mum illud fuerit, quod *minus* Homines,  
 seu *minus Rationis* compotes sumus.  
 Vides, mi Amice multum colende,  
 quod etiam dum de Pace loquor, *Impug-*  
*nationem* aggrediar ac Contentionem re-  
 cum denuo instaurem? Quare, cave si  
 tibi;



" tibi ; nam Novum Bellum Tibi indico,  
 " Provocationem Novam ad Te mitto.  
 " Spiculis non *umbratilibus*, sed verè *Ignis* (*Charitatis* scilicet) te adoriri decre-  
 " rum mihi est ; in quo profectò prælian-  
 " di genere usque ad mortem tecum decer-  
 " tabo. Quicquid nonnulli ex Amicis tuis  
 " de *Esse* meo existiment, audacter ja-  
 " ctabo quòd *Flotet* mihi partes, Tibi  
 " *Posteriori* in hac Lite Christiana cessuræ  
 " sint. Quod amplius est, palam pro-  
 " nuntio me *Lauream* in isthoc certamine  
 " *reparaturum* ; imò aliquàliter (quantum  
 " mihi liquet) jam *reparasse*. Præcipui si-  
 " quidem Tibi Honoris (non *denari*, sed  
 " *Solidi*) *Florem*, dum Prior ad Concor-  
 " diam gradum promoveo. Nisi forsàn  
 " & Tunc hoc idem fecisses, nisi quòd exi-  
 " stimâris me, (obfirmato utique, ut opi-  
 " natus es, ad bellum animo,) Pacem de-  
 " mediaturum. Id si profiteris, tunc enim  
 " verò fatendum est quòd inter utramque  
 " partem *— dubiū voluerit Victoria peniti.*  
 " Aliter, totam atque integram Trium-  
 " phum jure optimo mihi vendicabo. Si  
 " rationem exposcas, habeto Notissimum  
 " atque Sapiëntissimum Effatum illud,  
 " *— Fortior est qui se, quàm qui fortissima*  
 " *vincit Roma.* In quo quidem sensu,  
 " vel à Te, vel à quovis alio, *Pyrrus* poly-  
 " cas vocari non recusabo, imò Honori  
 " *mihi ducam.* ] &c.

TRUTH

## TRUTH and PEACE.

[“ A soft Answer breaks Anger ; Harsh  
 “ Speech stirs up Fury, says the  
 “ Wife-Man. The Prophet also, speak-  
 “ ing in GOD’s Name, exhorts us to love  
 “ TRUTH and PEACE. Both these  
 “ Sayings, Honoured Sir, we ought to  
 “ apply to our selves ; at least, I account  
 “ it my Duty to do so. Again, then, I  
 “ return to you ; again, I set upon you ;  
 “ not with a Mind full of Resentments,  
 “ but, of real Friendship : Not out of an  
 “ earnest Desire, and, perhaps, too sensi-  
 “ ble a Concern, to defend my own Fame ;  
 “ but, most ready to renew and repair  
 “ Charity and Friendship a-fresh, already  
 “ (alas ! ) too much violated. I must con-  
 “ fess, it struck me, and shock’d me exceed-  
 “ ingly, (and, no wonder,) that you should,  
 “ without the least Offence done to your  
 “ Person, who (as I thought) was still  
 “ my Friend ; but, out of a too fervent  
 “ Zeal for the Cartesian Doctrine, which I  
 “ impugn’d, and, perhaps, too easily per-  
 “ suaded by others transported with the  
 “ same Zeal, break out, in Print, into  
 “ Contumelious Words, more than was  
 “ Decent, against my Person, and my  
 “ Christian Reputation. That Saying of  
 “ King David, (Psal. 55.) came into my  
 “ Mind ;

"Mind; [*If my Enemy had revil'd me, I*  
 "could have born it— But, thou, my Friend  
 "and Acquaintance---who didst walk with me  
 "unanimously, in the House of GOD.]  
 "Thus, causlessly provok'd, I set to write  
 "my Defence: And, I wish I had con-  
 "tain'd my self within the Bounds of a  
 "meer Defence, or Vindication: For, 'tis  
 "very hard for any Man who is roughly  
 "handl'd, and (as far as he was conscious  
 "to himself) without Cause, to keep him-  
 "self within an Exact Mean. You re-  
 "ply'd; and, in your CENSURA, out-  
 "did your former Self, in Affrontive  
 "Language. What is now to be done?  
 "Must we still throw away our precious  
 "Time, and blur Paper with Angry Re-  
 "partees, reciprocated endlessly? 'Twere  
 "most Ridiculous! At length, then, let  
 "us grow wiser, and return to our Right  
 "Temper. We are, both of us, Men;  
 "that is, Frail, and tainted with Original  
 "Sin; but, yet, (as I hope,) so pre-esta-  
 "blish'd by Christian Principles, that the  
 "Poyson will be thrown out before it in-  
 "fects the Vitals of our Soul. Nor, let  
 "our Readers laugh at us; Themselves  
 "too have some of the same Pitch sticking  
 "to them, and are made up of the same  
 "Mafs of Corruption. And, perhaps,  
 "there are Few, who had not done the  
 "same we did, had they been in the same  
 K "Circum-

"Circumstances, and had had the same  
 "Thoughts and Affections. None but  
 "the Enemy of Mankind (and his *Imps*)  
 "can have just Occasion to laugh at us;  
 "who hates Peace, and delights to sow  
 "and foment Dissension. Let us, in our  
 "turn, laugh too at that Wicked Incen-  
 "diary; that he who digg'd a Pit for  
 "for others, may fall into it himself.  
 "Whatever Metaphysicians talk of their  
 "First Principles, and Highest Causes or  
 "Reasons, I am sure we are taught by far  
 "more Certain Principles, and Higher Rea-  
 "sons, establish'd, and commended to us  
 "by the Divine Law, that Brotherly Cha-  
 "rity is infinitely to be preferr'd before  
 "Philosophical Contests, or the Tenets of  
 "any Master, let him be who he will.  
 "We are Men, I say; and, thence, have  
 "suffer'd some *Humane* Imperfection: But  
 "we will let the World see, that we are  
 "such Men, as can correct in themselves  
 "whatever makes them less Men, or less  
 "Governable by Reason.

"You see then, my much-Honoured  
 "Friend, that even while I speak of Peace,  
 "I impugn you a-fresh, and renew my Con-  
 "test with you. Wherefore, look to your  
 "self; for, I denounce a *New War* to you,  
 "and send you a *New Challenge*; in which  
 "I will never yield the Victory. I am  
 "fully resolv'd to Attack you, not with  
 "Ima-

“*Imaginary Darts*, but with *Fiery* ones;  
“to wit, with those of *Charity*; with  
“which I will maintain the Combat, to  
“my last Breath: Whatever your Friends  
“talk of my *Pride* and *Arrogancy*, I boldly  
“proclaim, and boast, that I will have  
“the *Advantage* in this Christian Contention.  
“Nay, I do openly brag, that (as  
“far as yet appears to me) I have *already*  
“won the Victory; by getting the *Start*  
“of you in this War, (the *Guerdon* of  
“which is a *Crown*, not of *Aiery*, but of  
“*Solid Honour*,) by making thus the *first*  
“*Step* to a *Reconciliation*: Unless, perhaps,  
“your self also had intended the  
“*same*, had you not thought me to be *Refractory*.  
“If you profess you had the  
“*same* Thoughts, then I must, indeed,  
“confess, the Victory *hovers* doubtfully  
“between us: But, if *not*, the Whole and  
“Entire Triumph will be justly *due* to  
“me. If you ask me the Reason of this  
“forward *Condescension*; take for Answer,  
“that most Famous, and most Wise  
“Saying, [*’Tis a greater Victory to conquer*  
“*one’s self*, *than to subdue the strongest*  
“*Forts.*] In which Sense, I shall not be  
“*asham’d*; but, shall think it a *High Honour*  
“to be call’d by your self, or any  
“other, a *Pyrgopolynices*.]

95. I do not believe there is any Man in the World, who reads this Charitable Overture of mine, and considers all the Circumstances, but will both commend, and admire at, such an *Unexpected*, and *Extravagant Condescension*, and Moderation, on my part. Mr. *Le Grand* had been the *Unprovok'd Aggressor*; for, I had not given him *one Unhandsome Word*, but only oppos'd some *Cartesian Tenets*, by way of *Argument*; when he, in requital of my Civility, fell upon me with the the most *Virulent Language* that ever was heard given by (I will not say *any Christian*, but) even by any one *Heathen*, to another. Tho' my Defence was *Smart*, yet I confin'd my Resentments, to oppose him only as an *Injurious* and *Weak Writer*; without imitating him, by blackening him as *Impious against God*, or *Unsound in Faith*; but still excus'd him in such Occasions. He had printed Infamous Slanders against my Books, writ for the *Absolute Certainty of Faith*; making my Doctrine in them *Condemn'd by Serbonists*, *Retracted* and *Anatheimatiz'd by my self*; and, what not? He abetted a Known Libel, as a *most True History*; which makes me guilty of *Twenty Heresies* at least. Lastly, He had given me more *Advantages* against him, as a *Scholar*, in his *Censura*, than even my self could have wish'd. Yet, I was willing to pass by



all these *Highest Provocations*, and lose all these *Advantages*, and (*Unconstrain'd*) to make the *First Charitable Step* to a *Friendly Accommodation*; Requiring only, that he would make some *Publick Satisfaction*, not for any *Reviling Words*, or *Slanders*, against *my Particular Person*, (all which I was ready to pardon;) but, to wipe off the *False Aspersions* he had laid upon my *Books writ for Faith*, which reflected upon the *Common Cause of Religion*; to do which is the precise *Duty of every Good Man*: To promise which, notwithstanding, (by the way,) I could never learn he was *Willing*, or *Inclin'd*; Nor could I ever get any certain *Light* what he would do, or how far he would comply *on his part*. I had now finish'd about a *Third Part* of this *Healing Reply*, and had communicated this *Exordium* of it to some *Friends* of his; who, I dare say, had acquainted him with my *Peaceful and Friendly Intentions*; when, as if done *on purpose to prevent it*, out comes *Merry-man's LIBEL*, contriv'd and fram'd by some *Achitophel*, (I leave it to the *Reader* to guess whom,) to render all *Reconciliation Impossible*; and, *Tim'd* so, as to be Publish'd just in the *Nick*, when I was expecting that *Half-Sheet*, which (as I had requested in my *Non ULTRA*) was to decide the whole *Controversie*, by way of *PRINCIPLES*. This made



me see, that my Charity was requir'd with such a *Rude Affront*, that all the Malice in the World, put together, could scarce have invented any thing more *Rancorous*; and, that I was to content my self with my own good Intentions, and prepare for a *Vigorous Defence*. Which, also, was the reason why (putting a Stop to my *Latin Treatise*) I became oblig'd to reply in *English*, into which their Slanders were now brought; that so my *Answer* might be as *Universally Read*, and *Understood*, as Order had been taken their *Calumnies* should be: And, indeed, both Mr. *Le Grand*, and the Libeller, very Brotherly conspire to slander my Doctrine, as *Condemn'd*; or, which is the Word they do both of them affect, [*Damn'd*;] Whence, I saw plainly, that ~~this~~ Writing in English was Absolutely Necessary, and most proper to spread my Vindication, and make it more taken notice of.

96. I am to expect, that Mr. *Le Grand*, and his Inspirer, will stoutly deny that they are *Accessory* to this Libel, or knew of it: 'Tis their *Interest*, as well as their *Credit*, to do so. That they did not *per* it, I am apt to believe: Nor, is it Prudence to charge them positively with their *Knowing* it, *Liking* it, or (in their Way) *Abetting* it; unless I had Positive Testimony for it. But, yet, I must beg the Fa-  
 your

vour of them, to leave Thought Free: 'Tis best, in such Cases, to give my Reasons, and remit the *Decision* to the Judgment of *Prudent Readers*: For, First, I could never learn, that any one Man in *England* spoke the least Word against those two Books of mine, till Mr. *Le Grand* and his Governor did so; and, this Libel visibly *abets* them, and carries on the same Cause, viz. the *Defaming* of me: And, 'tis very hard to conceive, that one who *assists* another, should not let him know what Kindness he is doing him; or, that the *Assisted* Person should not *contribute* to his Power, and *help* those who were so kindly helping him; or, that a *Journey-man* should go to work without the Knowledge of his *Principal*; especially, when he uses *his Tools* all the while, as *Merry-man* does Mr. *Le Grand's Censura*; out of which, the whole Libel is Extracted. Secondly, I was inform'd, ere the Libel came out, by a worthy Gentleman (Mr. F. H.) that Mr. *Le Grand* had *struck in* with a certain Ecclesiastick, who would joyn with him, in opposing me; which, all things consider'd, especially, their sympathizing in their being, both of them, of a Light, Inconsiderate *Genius*, and, in their Aversion against me; makes it very Wonderful, and Unheard of, that *Confederates* should not communicate their Designs, or confer their

Notes, how to carry on their *Common Cause*. Thirdly, That Ecclesiastick spoke of, as siding with Mr. *Le Grand*, is the very Person who is universally said to be, at least, the *Parcel-Author* (if not the only one) of that Libel. Now, that a Concurrence in *Affections* (that is, in Disaffection to the same Person) should not produce a Concurrence in *Action*, when that Person is upon the Anvil, when they are both striking at him, and when the Resolution to run him down is already evidently Taken by both; let any Man believe that *can*. Fourthly, 'Tis evident, that they do *Mutuas operas tradere*, or friendly assist one another. Mr. *Le Grand* (I fear, in this, made *Foot-of-Whelp*) hazards his Credit, in defaming my Books, as *Condemn'd*; and crying up *Lominus's* Libel; so, to retrieve the Credit which was lost by a former Defeat: And, the Libeller, by taking his Matter out of his *Censura*, and echoing aloud all those Slanders in *English*, manifestly *abets him*, and requites his Kindness; and yet, we must believe (to the Forfeiture of Common Sense) that all this *lights by Chance*, and not by *Design*, or *Agreement*. Sure, they think all Men are Fools, but themselves; or else, they *Childishly* imagin, that while they *hood-wink* themselves, none *can see* them. Fifthly, The Opposing *Cartesius* would not bear the

the weight of an Accusation in the High Court ; whereas, the Magnifying *Albius*, who had given Disgust to them above, would easily, as they hop'd, if well improv'd, and manag'd, be made Criminal, if they could but catch me in that Snare : But, it light unluckily to their Project, that (resolving to live quietly with my Neighbours, if I could ; and, to carry on *Truth*, without giving *Offence* to any) I had not, so much as *once*, nam'd Mr. *White* in either of those two Books the Libeller is so angry at ; nor have I any Position there, *peculiar* to him alone ; as I can easily shew, when put to it. Wherefore, it was plotted to bring me, by *Stratagem*, to name Mr. *White*, with some handsome Character. To this End, Mr. *Le-Grand*, in his Railing Preface, p. 79. (by which we may see 'tis an *Old Project*,) challeng'd me, that I did [*eradere Albium ex albo Philosophorum, & in ludibria vertere ;*] that is, that I did blot Mr. *White* out of the Roll of *Philosophers*, and make a *Mockery* of him : And, I was blam'd by them, as proudly dis-regarding all others, and assuming all to my self. I might have smelt a *Design* in it, it being such Nonsense, that I should make a *Mockery* of a Man I had not so much as *spoke of* : But, I was too *Candid*, to give easie way to *Suspensions*. Upon which, hating to be held Guilty of such

an

an *Ungentleness*, I made mention of him in my following Books, tho' under no other Character, but only that of a *Great Philosopher*, which his worst Enemies cannot refuse him. No sooner had I done so, and that he had drawn me into the Noose, but the *Cloak* was immediately pull'd off; and, the *same* Man who had lately seem'd so zealous for the Honour of *Albius*, presently profess'd himself his greatest Enemy: He sets up, and abets *Lominus's* Libel, which makes him Guilty of half the Heresies that have pester'd the World, from the Beginning of the Church; and, a Mark is set on every Man who has any Esteem for him, as a *Scholar*: And, I was told by a Right Reverend Bishop, that I had done my self a greater Injury, by speaking well of *Albius*, than I could imagin; as fore-seeing the Malicious Use they intended to make of this Fraudulent Trappan. All which, laid together, shews the Intimate Correspondence between Mr. *Le Grand*, and the Libeller; and, to think that his Old Friend, who began all this *Stir*, would not joyn with him in this, and gather a few *Twigs* to help to *lash* me, were, to break the Sacred Bond of Friendship between them, and disoblige them both. Add, that Mr. *Le Grand*, according to his small Politicks, to gratifie his New Friend, picks Quarrels with me, in his behalf, by  
making

making me say of Bellarmin, (an Author he much esteems,) Bellarmine, *Rationis expers, mentis.* Which, and divers such Passages, are too plain Evidences of their strict Confederacy; and, consequently, that he could not be ignorant of this Prop of his Cause, this Libel. His Hopes were, that the Libeller would bring in divers Friends of his, to increase the Cry, and assist him with their Interest: But, I will not think them to have so little Charity, or so little Regard to Religion; or, to be so Imprudent, as to oppose a *Veteran Writer for Faith*, who meddles not with them; against whom they have nothing to say, *Justly*; and, who has already given good Proof, that, in case he be attack'd *Unjustly*, he is able to defend himself; nay, who is before-hand with them too, should they attempt it.

97. Against all these strong Proofs of their being *Conscious* of, and (in what they could) *Abetting* to this Libel, what can they bring for themselves? Oh! they *Deny* it: As if, either *Affirming*, or *Denying*, were such most Valid Arguments for Persons speaking in their own Cause! Or, as if I (who was the Person concern'd) ought, in Prudence, to give any Credit to the Words of those Men; one of which *smil'd in my Face*, and pretended great *Friendship*, when he was doing me all the *Mischief*.



Mischief he could : The Other so falsifies my Words, and publishes such False and and Scandalous Slanders against my Doctrine. Whence, that Objection is Groundless, which (for want of something else to say) is lately given about, that Things were about *Composing*, and I, upon Occasion unjustly taken at this Libel, flew off ; and, so *continu'd* the Difference, when it might have been *heal'd*. These Gentlemen are either *Ill-inform'd*, or *very Partial* : For, 1. He never offer'd Peace *at all* : 2. I offer'd it (as a Judicious Friend, meeting with my Thoughts, had advis'd me) *on these Terms* ; *viz.* Heartily to pardon and pass over all his Causeless Revilings against my *Particular* ; only desiring, that the Injury done to the Common Cause should be *Repair'd* ; to which I could never hear he would yield. Some cry [*Pax, Pax ; ubi non est Pax.*] I had never observ'd the least *Ingenuity* on their side ; and, I had been false to my self, to print my Condescending Treatise, and be laugh'd at for my Foolish Charity ; and, Advantages be made of it, against my self. Nay, I ever reply'd, to those Good Men who desir'd it of me, that I would do any thing that could be thought reasonable ; but, that I much fear'd, all our Charity would be lost, thro' Mr. *Le Grand's* being ty'd up by this New Engagement, and govern'd by



by a Man who was an Enemy to all Moderation.

98. I expect, Gentlemen, you will complain you have lost your Time in Reading this Treatise; and ask, What Benefit accrues to the Reader, by seeing the Faults of others laid open? But, I must beg your Pardon; and maintain, that this Procedure, tho' most Unpleasant to me, is, notwithstanding, most Beneficial to the World. [*Virtus est Vitium fugare, & Sapientia Prima Stultitia caruisse—*] And, these Idle Methods of Railing, Flouting, Prevaricating, Bantering, Fooling, Slandering, Falsifying and Libelling, (to which Nonplus'd Writers are forc'd to have recourse,) being thus *Expos'd*; and, by your declaring against them, *Disgrac'd*; they must either be driven to take the Way of Discourfing *Connectedly*, or leave of Writing at all. To return then to my Adversaries: I *Request*, or (it being my Right) *Demand* of them, that they would make choice of some one Principle for the *Cartesian* Doctrine, which they will maintain to be such; or, some one *Argument* of theirs, which they will undertake to be *Demonstrative*; or, pitch upon some one *Solution* of theirs, to any one *Argument* of mine, where I pretend to *Demonstrate*; and, that Principle shall be *Examin'd*, by looking into the Self-Conexion of its Terms, or the

the Reducibleness of them to *Self-Connexion*, or *Self-Evidence*; that *Argument* shall be try'd by the Necessary Connexion of its Terms, with the *Medium*; and, lastly, that *Solution* shall be judg'd of, by putting my *Argument home*, shewing on *what* the Connexion of the Two Terms with a Third, was *built*; and, then, considering upon what Grounds it is pretended they are *Unconnected*, the Consequence of it *Slack*, and the Reason of it *Solv'd*. And, let him who uses the least Disrespectful Word to his Adversary, be held *Nonplus'd*, and to *deserve no Answer*. By this means, in a Reply or two, Truth will be made appear, much precious Time *sav'd*, all Wrangling *avoided*, the Rules of Decency and Civility *preserv'd* Inviolat, and the Controversie *decided*.

99. Only, this Condition I would request, That if any *Principle*, *Axiom*, *Postulatum*, or *Argument*, be produc'd, which has been solidly Refuted *already*; that, then, to save Unnecessary Labour, it may be sufficient to *relate to it*, unless it has been Reply'd to formerly: Which I desire, because I have very lately seen and perus'd a Book, written by a Professor of Philosophy in *Paris*, and Dedicated to the Dean and Faculty of *Sorbon*; in which, many of the Principal Positions of the *Cartesians* are solidly Confuted. It bears  
for

for Title, [*De Existentiâ Dei, & Humanae  
Mentis Immortalitate, secundum Cartesii & A-  
ristotelis Doctrinam, Disputatio.*] This A-  
cute and Learned Author is thorowly ver-  
sed in *Cartesius*; and has so perfectly di-  
gested *Aristotle*; that he seems to have tur-  
ned him in *Succum & Sanguinem*. He tells  
us, *Cartesius* attempted to Demonstrate  
these two Points, because he was (I believe,  
Unjustly) suspected to hold neither of them.  
He refutes his Definitions of [*Cogitatio,  
Idea, Substantia, & Mens:*] As also, his  
Notion of [*Corpus, Materia, Extensio, Phy-  
sica, &c.*] He shews his Definition of GOD,  
to be Faulty; and, his Notion of *Real Di-  
stinction*, to be Groundless. He lists all  
his Seven *Postularums*, his Ten *Axioms*,  
and all his pretended Demonstrations of  
those Two most Important *Theses*; and,  
shews them to be *Shallow*, and *Spurious*.  
Lastly, In his Second Part, he *Demonstrates*  
those main Points, by the Principles of  
*Aristotle*. Tho' a School-man, (indeed,  
the Best of our Modern ones, I have seen,)  
and, for being such, ought to have some  
Grains of Allowance granted him; yet,  
he avoids School-Terms as much as is  
possible. His Style is Concise, and yet  
Clear. His Oppositions and Solutions  
(generally) *Forceful*, and *Full*. He lights,  
frequently, into the same Arguments I do;  
and, very often falls into my Abominable  
Sin,

Sin, (which so mads my two *Cartesians*,) of telling his Reader, and *showing*, that the *Cartesian* Doctrine is strangely **FANATICAL**. I thought fit to acquaint our Country-men with the Just Character of that Learned Book; than which, I know none more Proper for those of our Universities, after they have pass'd their *First Studies*; as well for the Excellency of the two Noble Truths it demonstrates, as for giving them great Light to look into the Nature of True *Demonstration*, and and into the Right Understanding of *Aristotle's* Genuin Doctrine; so much mistaken by most of our Unskilful Modern Commentators.

100. I hear, my Adversaries contend, that (*Id. Cart. p. 64.*) I deny Annihilation to be Possible, even to GOD's Extraordinary or Miraculous Power. I answer, 1. That I speak there, (§. 42.) not of Annihilation *it self*, but of a particular Way I was inventing, *how* it might be done; which Way, whether it holds, or no, I neither *know*, nor *care*. 2. I did not seem to deny even *This*, but upon Supposition that it would put an Attribute in GOD, which was unworthy of Him. 3. That, in my whole Discourse there, 'tis most Evident that I only spoke *sentative*, not *assertive*. I will not recount how many Authors have held the same,

Same, as to this Point, which my self (if truly represented) have done: One will suffice, *ad hominem*, against my Cartesian Adversaries; viz. Du Hamel; the Best Philosopher of the Cartesian School, tho' he be none of the Fierce, or Furious ones; who, in *Tom 5. p. 8.* says, *Substantia Annihilatio aliquid Inconstantie in ipso rei Conditore testari videtur*: The Annihilation of a Substance (or Thing) seems to testify some Inconstancy in the Maker of the Thing, Himself: Which, certainly, is a Dishonour, and Imperfection; and, cannot be attributed to GOD. The Sense of that Position, as far as concerns the Generality of Christians, who are no Speculators, is, that Creatures should not be held, to subsist of themselves; but, to depend entirely, every Moment, on GOD, for their Being. Now, let us consider how I had exceeded all other Writers, in Asserting that Substantial Truth. Others use to say, that the Nature of Creatures is Indifferent to Being, and Not-Being: Whereas, (*Method to Science, p. 304.*) I maintain, that, [Were there any Inclination in Creatures, rather to One, than the Other, it seems to be, rather to Not-Being, than to Being;] And, that [the Nothingness of Creatures is so radicated in their Natures, and sticks to them, that it inclines them to Not-Being,

even while they are.]. Whether this Doctrine of mine be more for the Honour of our Great Creator, and for our Continual Dependence on Him; or Mr. Le Grand's, in his *Censura*, p. 71. who denies that Creatures would, out of their own *Defectiveness*, or *Indigent Condition*, fall to *Nothing*, or be *Annihilated*; and says, that *every thing*, as far as is of it self, would remain in the same State; let Indifferent Divines judge. Nay, he says this, in Opposition to me, when I affirm, that all Creatures depend on GOD, for their *Continuance in Being*. Certainly, there needs many Grains of Salt, to make such Doctrine as this sound well to a Christian's Ear: For, this destroys the Doctrine of *Suspension's* being the Cause of *Annihilation*; in regard he makes the Creature *still*, of its own *Nature*, able to *Exist alone*, after it is once put to be; which, I am sure, takes away its *Continual Dependence on GOD*, for its *Being*; which is both against the *Language and Sense of Christianity*. Yet, I doubt not, but his Intention is very *Orthodox*, whatever his *Ideas* are.

By this time, Gentlemen, I fear I have over-weary'd you; I am sure I have my self,

*by Calm Reason.*

211

self, with Replying, by Snatches, to Un-  
connected Talk. I hope, my next Present  
will be more worthy of your Perusal.  
In the mean time, I am, with all Re-  
spect,

*Your most*

*Humble Servant,*

**J. S.**

**F I N I S.**